



PARKS & RECREATION ELEMENT

LAS VEGAS 2020
MASTER PLAN

DRAFT

executive summary

introduction

background

existing conditions

analysis

implementation

conclusion



Adopted by
City Council xx-xx-07

Updated
Month-Date-07

The City of Las Vegas Parks & Recreation Element
of the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan
was adopted by City Council
on March 15, 2000 (Resolution # 44-2000)
and revised on _____
(GPA-24206).



CITY OF LAS VEGAS PARKS & RECREATION ELEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
INTRODUCTION	3
Enabling Legislation.....	3
Relationship to the Master Plan.....	3
History of Parks Planning & Development in Las Vegas	7
BACKGROUND.....	13
Status of Las Vegas' Park System.....	13
EXISTING CONDITIONS	21
Planning Context.....	21
Policy Framework	21
Existing Facilities.....	24
Trends	34
Funding Sources.....	38
ANALYSIS.....	41
Level of Service Analysis	41
Spatial Analysis	47
Needs Assessment Survey.....	55
Functional Analysis	58
IMPLEMENTATION.....	63
Recommendation #1: Build Neighborhood Parks in Dense, Chronically Underserved Areas	63
Strategies	64
Recommendation #2: Connect Parks and Leisure Facilities Planning to the CIP Process	65
Strategies	65
Recommendation #3: Build Amenities to Keep Pace with Growth.....	66
Strategies	66
Recommendation #4: Implement Urban Pathways in Lieu of Green Space in Urban Core.....	67
Strategies	67
CONCLUSION	69
REFERENCES	71

TABLES AND MAPS

TABLES

Table 1:	Status of Urban Pathways Projects	15
Table 2:	Park Categories.....	18
Table 3:	Leisure Facility Categories.....	20
Table 4:	Park Acreage & Service Levels	25
Table 5:	Parks & Leisure Services Facilities Citywide.....	26
Table 6:	Parks & Leisure Services Facilities Southeast Sector.....	27
Table 7:	Parks & Leisure Services Facilities Southwest Sector	28
Table 8:	Parks & Leisure Services Facilities Centennial Hills Sector	29
Table 9:	Leisure Services Facilities/Centers Citywide.....	30
Table 10:	Aquatic Centers Citywide	32
Table 11:	Proposed Leisure Services Facilities.....	33
Table 12:	Current & Projected Service Levels Citywide	43
Table 13:	Current & Projected Service Levels Southeast Sector	44
Table 14:	Current & Projected Service Levels Centennial Hills Sector	45
Table 15:	Current & Projected Service Levels Southwest Sector	46
Table 16:	Underserved Population & Housing Age Southeast Sector*	48
Table 17:	Underserved Population & Housing Age Southwest Sector*.....	49
Table 18:	Underserved Population & Housing Age Centennial Hills Sector*.....	50
Table 19:	Leisure Facility Needs by Sector	57
Table 20:	Recreation Facilities Service Standards Citywide.....	59
Table 21:	Recreation Facilities Service Standards Southeast Sector	60
Table 22:	Recreation Facilities Service Standards Southwest Sector.....	60
Table 23:	Recreation Facility Service Standards - Centennial Hills Sector	61

TABLES AND MAPS, CONTINUED

MAPS

Map 1.	Existing City Parks & Recreational Centers.....	73
Map 2.	Existing City Parks Centennial Hills Sector.....	75
Map 3.	Existing City Parks Southwest Sector	77
Map 4.	Existing City Parks Southeast Sector.....	79
Map 5.	Golf Courses and Privately Maintained Parks.....	81
Map 6.	Access,Availability, Service Area Coverage.....	83
Map 7.	Regional, Community, and Neighborhood Leisure Service Centers.....	85
Map 7a.	Neighborhood Leisure Service Centers	87
Map 7b.	Community Leisure Service Centers	89
Map 7c.	Regional Leisure Service Centers.....	91
Map 7d.	Aquatic Centers.....	93
Map 8.	Schools with leisure Services Programming.....	95
Map 9.	Park Coverage per Sector.....	97
Map 10.	City Wide Population Density.....	99
Map 11.	Population Density of Areas with No-Service.....	101
Map 12.	Population in Underserved Areas.....	103
Map 13.	Park Acreage per 1,000 Residents within 1/2 Mile Radius of a Neighborhood Park.....	105
Map 14.	Average Housing Age in Underserved Areas Based on Year of Construction	107
Map 15.	Areas with High Population Densities and Older Housing Stock	109

APPENDICES (PLEASE SEE MASTER PLAN APPENDICES BINDER)



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The city of Las Vegas adopted a Parks & Recreation Element of the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan on March 15, 2000. The planning process allowed residents, city leaders, city departments and park advocates to reach consensus on goals and objectives.

The Master Plan and its elements must be periodically updated to address the evolving nature of growth and development in the city and the needs and desires of its citizens. This update is intended to build upon previous plans, measure our progress, and set new priorities for achieving equity in the provision of parks and recreation services.

Since adoption of the Parks & Recreation Element in 2000, the city has increased its service level from 1.1 park acres per 1,000 residents to 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents, exceeding the goal of 2.5 acres per 1,000 set at that time. Despite this advance in the overall level of service, there are still large areas of the city that are underserved by parks and recreation facilities, with 44% of the population not having a neighborhood park within walking distance of their homes.

The most densely populated neighborhoods that have endured the longest periods of time with substandard service have been identified in this update as top priorities for new parks and neighborhood centers.

Key recommendations from this update of the Parks & Recreation Element are to:

Build neighborhood parks in dense, chronically underserved areas

- Approve new parks based upon prioritized locations set by term and size of underserved population.

Connect parks planning to the Capital Improvements Program

- Coordinate recreational developments requiring capital expenditure so that budgeting and parks planning priorities are linked logically and efficiently.
- Monitor the population growth, change in recreation trends, and levels of service, to better identify projects for the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) plan.
- Update the Parks & Recreation Element annually after the adoption of the capital budget to account for new parks that have been constructed and to update planned parks. Perform new level of service spatial analysis to determine if the City is meeting established goals and meet federal standards.



*All American and
Aloha Shores Parks*

Build amenities to keep pace with growth

- Provide active leisure services facilities based on the adjusted national standards and aim to tailor service standards for leisure services facilities to the population's identified needs.
- Continue biannual assessments to measure resident's park and recreational needs.
- New park design shall take into consideration existing amenities in the area and aim to reduce deficiencies.

Implement urban pathways in lieu of green spaces in urban core

- Along with the Redevelopment Agency, formulate a land acquisition strategy for inclusion in the Downtown Centennial Plan.
- Develop guidelines for future private open spaces.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this update of the Parks & Recreation Element of the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan is to provide a report on the status of the city's parks system, a current inventory of existing parks and leisure facilities, an analysis of future needs, and recommendations for meeting these needs. This analysis uses a multi-faceted methodology that examines the spatial and functional characteristics of the parks and recreation facility system relative to national and local standards. This approach has allowed delineation of service deficiencies in terms of geographic distribution and temporal duration.

This update identifies the most densely populated areas of the city that have been underserved for the longest periods of time. Recommendations for improving the equitable provision of parks and recreation facilities based on this analysis are found in the implementation section of this document.

ENABLING LEGISLATION

State planning law, as contained in the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), provides that in counties of 400,000 or more in population, the governing entity must adopt a master plan to address a number of subject areas.

One of these subject areas is a recreation plan. NRS 278.160 states that a recreation plan is to show a comprehensive system of recreation areas, including, without limitation, natural reservations, parks, parkways, trails, reserved riverbank strips, beaches, playgrounds and other recreation areas, including, when practicable, the locations and proposed development thereof. This Parks & Recreation Element update includes information pertinent to recreation areas found in the city of Las Vegas, including parks, playgrounds and other recreation areas. Information on recreation trails is contained in the Recreation Trails Element that was revised in January 2005.

The inventory, analysis and recommendations in this updated Parks & Recreation Element will serve as the city of Las Vegas' recreation plan, and in combination with the Recreation Trails Element, will satisfy the statutory requirements.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE MASTER PLAN

The City of Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan consists of a series of goals, objectives and policies and a collection of plans, or elements. The policy document, adopted by City Council in September 2000, contains a broad policy structure intended to



*Angel and An San
Sister City Parks*

direct the actions of the City regarding land use and development over the period from 2000 to 2020. The individual elements are intended to provide more specific direction, through detailed analysis and recommended actions, as to how the City should react to certain land use issues.

Completed in 2000, the Master Plan policy document is organized into seven themes, developed by the Master Plan Steering Committee composed of civic leaders, homeowners associations, land use attorneys, planners, and more, along with a Technical Committee comprised of City department heads and outside agencies. Some of the themes follow geographic boundaries: Reurbanization (Downtown), Neighborhood Revitalization (central city areas) and Newly Developing Area (new suburban development). Others are broad topic areas that apply to the entire city. Each theme contains goals, objectives and policies that provide broad policy context for that area.

The following goals, objectives and policies from the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan provide the policy framework and direction for the preparation of the Parks & Recreation Element.

REURBANIZATION

GOAL 1: The Downtown area will emerge as the preeminent hub of business, residential, government, tourism and gaming activities in the City of Las Vegas and as a major hub of such activities in the Las Vegas Valley.

OBJECTIVE 1.2: To improve the livability of the Downtown through the creation of a series of safe, attractive and interesting public open spaces and non-vehicular routes to connect these open spaces and other major Downtown activities.

POLICY 1.2.1: That each District be focused around a central open space, park, public facility or landmark which lends identity and character to that District.

POLICY 1.2.2: That a major civic square, open space or park be developed in the central business/government district core, to serve as a focal point for the City and contribute to the identity, functionality and amenity of the Downtown.

POLICY 1.2.3: That all Downtown parks and open spaces be linked with non-vehicular corridors or routes. These routes may incorporate a theme, and should be readily identifiable through sidewalk treatments, signage, lighting, landscaping and other techniques. Enhanced streetscapes should be developed along selected corridors. The intent is to foster a safe, pleasant and convenient pedestrian environment. The City will promote the use of public/private partnerships to develop Downtown open space.

NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION

GOAL 2: Mature neighborhoods will be sustained and improved through appropriate and selective high quality redevelopment and preservation.

OBJECTIVE 2.4: To ensure that the quality of existing residential neighborhoods within the City of Las Vegas is maintained and enhanced.

POLICY 2.4.1: That the City aggressively promote, on an opportunity basis, the acquisition and development of land for parks in central city locations.

POLICY 2.4.2: That the City continue to improve the level of maintenance of existing park areas within the City.

NEWLY DEVELOPING AREAS

GOAL 3: Newly developing areas of the City will contain adequate educational facilities, and recreational and open space and be linked to major employment centers by mass transit, including buses, and by trails.

OBJECTIVE 3.1: To ensure that new residential subdivisions, with the exception of areas currently designated as rural preservation neighborhoods by Nevada statute, are developed into walkable communities, where reliance on auto trips for convenience shopping and access to education and recreation is minimized, and where development densities support transit.

POLICY 3.1.3: That residential areas be within walking distance of a neighborhood park.

OBJECTIVE 3.4: To ensure that adequate portions of the lands released for urban development by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) are developed for recreational and educational public facilities, transit facilities and fire stations, that will benefit the City.

POLICY 3.4.1: That a minimum of 30 percent of available BLM lands be planned for recreational and parks uses within the northwest sector of the City, in the general vicinity of the intersection of Kyle Canyon Road and US 95.

POLICY 3.4.2: That detailed plans for recreation, parks and other uses be set forth in a special area plan for the Kyle Canyon area. Any future Kyle Canyon special area plan shall include policies to ensure that an acceptable percentage of the residential and commercial portions of Town Center are developed before residential, commercial and industrial development is allowed in Kyle Canyon. The growth planned for the Kyle Canyon area should not be in direct competition with any undeveloped portions of Town Center, and direct competition with Downtown growth should also be considered.

OBJECTIVE 3.6: To ensure that adequate amounts of park space and trail systems are designed and developed to meet or exceed national standards and standards established in the Master Plan Parks & Recreation Element.

POLICY 3.6.1: That the City establish a parks system based on systematic parks classifications, park size requirements and service area standards.

POLICY 3.6.2: That new developments pay their fair share of park land acquisition and development costs to ensure that national and local standards are met for such new development.

POLICY 3.6.3: That the City obtain lands for parks in developed portions of the City where established park standards are not being met.

POLICY 3.6.4: That lands acquired for parks purposes be obtained in proactive ways, including land purchase through bond issues and land exchanges.

POLICY 3.6.5: That the City maintain high standards with respect to the maintenance and operation of existing parks.

POLICY 3.6.6: That the City encourage the joint development of park space in conjunction with school sites, under the Open Schools/Open Doors agreement.

REGIONAL COORDINATION

GOAL 7: Issues of regional significance, requiring the city of Las Vegas to coordinate with other government entities and agencies within the Valley, will be addressed in a timely fashion.

OBJECTIVE 7.6: To ensure that joint use of public facilities is pursued to provide efficient and cost effective services and facilities.

POLICY 7.6.1: That the City coordinate with other public agencies in the Las Vegas Valley to pursue the design and construction of public facilities to have multiple uses.

HISTORY OF PARKS PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION IN LAS VEGAS

Parks and recreation service has been provided by the city of Las Vegas for over 50 years, beginning in 1949 with the administration of leisure services by the Department of Parks and Leisure Activities. Over time, the administration of the park system has changed as the City has grown and the local government has expanded to meet the needs of residents.

The idea of building parks, particularly downtown, is not new. Research of adopted plans tracing back to 1960 uncovered a series of implementation actions calling for the development of more parks in the urban core of Las Vegas. Therefore, it is critical that the future of park planning include provisions for recreational opportunities in the urban core. Listed below is a chronology, with description, of park and related plans for Las Vegas:

LAS VEGAS PLANS ITS FUTURE – COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN

Adopted by Board of City Commissioners on March 2, 1960

- Plate 16 shows an existing “District Playground & Park” centrally located between Bonanza and Mesquite, and 2nd (now Casino Center) & Las Vegas Blvd (known as Squires Park).
- Plate 16 shows proposed “District Playground & Park” and a “Neighborhood Playground & Park” in the vicinity of present day Sandhill and Owens.
- Plate 16 shows proposed “District Playground & Park” and a “Neighborhood Playground & Park” in the vicinity of present day Alta and Rancho.

LAS VEGAS GENERAL PLAN

Adopted 1975

- Policy 6.2.2.1 (page T-9) “The City will integrate its own Bicycle Route Plan 73 with those of surrounding governmental entities so as to develop a continuous metropolitan bike path network. The bike path routing will be designed to connect parks and recreation facilities, schools, various public facilities, major employment centers, regional and district commercial centers, and cultural, historic and, scenic points of interest...”
- Policy 7.2.3 (Page PR-4) “The City will apply these effective service areas to the existing park inventory in



*Baker and
Barkin' Basin Parks*

order to locate those areas of the community that are either well served or poorly served by the City's parks and recreation system and, thus where new parks should be developed."

- Figure PR.1 shows 4 existing neighborhood parks (1/4 mile service radius) within the area bounded by Main, US 95, Maryland Parkway and Sahara Ave. The figure calls for 3 more neighborhood parks in that area to serve future population.
- Policy 7.6.3 (Page PR-12) "Small, scattered parcels of land within residential area that are not usually considered for park development according to hierarchical standards can and will be developed and designed as mini-parks."
- Policy 7.8.3 (Page PR-14) "The City will develop Squires Park and/or a new park site in the central business district as an urban park designed for the use of those who work and/or conduct business in the downtown area. Adequate passive recreation facilities such as picnic tables and park benches, attractive landscaping, and innovative design are critical elements in attracting potential users to this type of specialized park and will thus be provided."
 - Squires Park is shown on the 1960's plan between Bonanza and Mesquite, and 2nd (now Casino Center) and Las Vegas Blvd.
- Objective 8.12 (Page V-4) "Strengthen the importance and enhance the attractiveness of the downtown area."
- Policy 8.12.1 (Page V-4) "The City will initiate a Precise Plan for the downtown areas that will include considerations of (1) landscaping (2) pedestrian mall/walking areas, (3) urban park areas, (4) street furniture, and (5) residential uses.

CITY OF LAS VEGAS GENERAL PLAN

Adopted by the City Council on January 16, 1985

- Policy 8.1.2 Program 1 "Develop neighborhood and community parks to serve the needs of residents throughout all areas of the City."
- Policy 10.2.1 "It is policy to encourage creative design, incorporating concepts such as plazas, landscaped open areas, urban art and amenities in public spaces, and separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, in Activity Centers throughout the City."
- Objective 10.4 "Enhancement of the central city areas as a unique Activity Center."
- Objective 10.6 Program 1 "Designate landscaping improvements on city thoroughfares as deemed appropriate."

- Policy 10.6.2 "It is policy to encourage and cooperate with private efforts to provide attractive public improvements such as street furniture, benches, kiosks, and fountains at appropriate locations."

CITY OF LAS VEGAS GENERAL PLAN

Adopted April 1, 1992

- Section 3G.2 Issues (Issue 5: Recreational Trails) "A rapidly growing urban area also has growing demands for recreational facilities. It becomes more and more important to furnish facilities and access to them...facilities which can be reached by pedestrian, bicycle or equestrian travel helps alleviate some of the stress on our transportation system as well as providing a form of recreation itself."
- Policy A2 (Program A2.1) "Continue to develop neighborhood and community parks to serve the needs of residents throughout all areas of the City."
- Policy A2 (Program A2.3) "Identify opportunities to provide linkages, such as recreational trails between parks and recreation in accordance with the update of the City's General Plan."
- Policy B2 (Program B2.1) "Develop urban design guidelines, regulations and/or plans to assist in developing attractive and efficient City street and highway systems pedestrian/equestrian/bicycle trail systems, and transit and parking facilities..."

The City restructured the method by which parks are planned, constructed and maintained in the mid-1990s. Currently, four City departments, Leisure Services, Field Operations, Detention & Enforcement and Planning and Development, are involved in managing and providing security of the park system. Collaboration amongst staffs in these departments is essential to the successful provision of park and leisure services to the community.

DEPARTMENT OF LEISURE SERVICES

The Department is responsible for programming and staffing of leisure service centers and programming parks. Leisure Services also oversees the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission. The secretary is the Director of Leisure Services and does not have a vote on the commission. Eleven commission members are appointed by the City Council and serve for a three-year term. The Commission's duties are:

- To make recommendations, in cooperation with the Director of the Department of Leisure Services, to the City Council on matters pertaining to public parks and



*Bob Baskin, Bradley
Bridle Path, Bunker and
Cameron Community Parks*

public recreation and to cooperate with other governmental agencies and civic groups to facilitate sound park and recreation planning;

- To aid in coordinating the parks and recreation services with other governmental agencies and other voluntary organizations;
- To assist in the functions of the Department of Leisure Services which involve or affect the public; and
- To make recommendations to the City Council on matters pertaining to municipal golf courses, including, but not limited to capital improvements and green fees or any other charges to the public for use of the facilities

DEPARTMENT OF FIELD OPERATIONS

The City's Field Operations Department is responsible for coordinating land resources with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and maintenance of park facilities. One critical component of the park system under the purview of Field Operations is management of Recreation and Public Purpose (R&PP) leases between the BLM and the City of Las Vegas. The majority of city parks are located on land the City leases from the BLM. An explanation of the lease process is below.

DEPARTMENT OF DETENTION & ENFORCEMENT

The Department of Detention & Enforcement provides law enforcement services to Las Vegas residents, businesses and visitors so they can enjoy a safe community. The deputy city marshals are responsible for patrolling property owned, leased, or otherwise under the control of the city of Las Vegas, including city parks, recreation facilities and government buildings. Deputy marshals work closely with Leisure Services to manage programs and special events on city property. Animal Control also plays a key role by monitoring activities within the various dog parks throughout the city to ensure the safety of those utilizing these special facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

The Department of Planning & Development prepares plans for future park needs through the Parks & Recreation Element of the Master Plan. Master plans were prepared in 1960, 1975, 1985, 1992 and 2000. The plans documented existing conditions and set park policy for the City. Maps included in the plans are particularly useful for gauging the growth of

the city's park system through the decades. Past policies are also significant as they indicate the City's priorities and perspective on park issues, and shed light on how those have changed/evolved over time.

Downtown Centennial Plan

An integral part of the Master Plan, the Downtown Centennial Plan contains provisions for a network of cultural and recreational pocket parks that, together, are known as Urban Pathways. The vision for these parks include small, fenced areas for doggy aerobics, tot lots, human chess, hand-ball courts, small areas with walls for practicing tennis, perhaps even putting areas. Furthermore, goals of the plan include the provision of open space as an active and passive element of the pedestrian streetscape experience downtown.

Master Plan/Capital Improvement Plan Integration

With more and more projects vying for limited funding, the need for a system of prioritizing projects (including parks) has become paramount. As such, internal efforts are being made to incorporate priorities as determined by the Master Plan into the application and subsequent fund allocation process of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Currently, there is no requirement on the internal application for funding that mandates compliance with the goals and priorities of the Master Plan.

Recreation and Public Purpose Leases

Finding land that can be developed as park space is critical in addressing the recreational needs of the City. To accomplish this task, the Real Estate division of the Field Operations Department, in existence for approximately 13 years, examines where predicted growth is expected within municipal boundaries and applies for Recreational and Public Purpose Act (R&PP) lease applications from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) on Federal land. The Recreation and Public Purposes Act (68 Statute 173; 43 United States Code 869 et. seq.), enacted by Congress in 1954, was a complete revision of the Recreation Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 741) that governs this process. This law is administered by the BLM.

The Act authorizes the sale or lease of public lands for recreational or public purposes to state and local governments and to qualified non-profit organizations. Examples of typical uses under the Act are historic monument sites, campgrounds, schools, fire houses, law enforcement facilities, municipal facilities, landfills, hospitals, parks, and fairgrounds. The Act applies to all public lands, except lands within national forests, national parks and monuments, national wildlife refuges, Indian lands, and acquired lands. The amount of land an applicant can purchase is set by law. Whether the land is to be purchased or leased, the BLM will classify, for purposes of the Act, only the



*Centennial Hills and
Centennial Plaza Parks*

amount of land required for efficient operation of the projects described in an applicant's development plan. Applicants must limit the land requested to a reasonable amount. Applicants are required to first accept a lease, or lease with option to purchase, to assure approved development takes place before a sale is made and a patent (government deed) is issued. Projects that may include the disposal, placement, or release of hazardous materials (i.e., sanitary landfills) may go directly to patent.

Counties, cities, or other political subdivisions of a State and non-profit organizations may purchase up to 640 acres a year for recreation purposes, and an additional 640 acres for other public purposes. These lands must be within the political boundaries of the agency or within the area of jurisdiction of the organization or, in the case of cities, they must lie within convenient access to the municipality and within the same state. The Act sets no limitation on the amount of land that may be leased. Some lease applications have been in place for 20 years and still have not processed because the need to develop in those areas has not presented itself.

BACKGROUND

STATUS OF LAS VEGAS' PARK SYSTEM

The Parks & Recreation Element of the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan was adopted March 15, 2000 through action R-44-2000. Since that time, the population of the City has increased by 22.5 percent, and the City has experienced demographic shifts and corresponding changes in the demand for parks and recreation.

The purpose of this update is to document existing resources, analyze progress made since 2000 and make recommendations on how to further the Master Plan's goals relating to parks and recreation.

This update is intended to build upon previous efforts by:

- Updating the existing public park and recreational facility inventory;
- Updating public need and demand for park and recreational facilities resources; and
- Updating the implementation program for developing and/or refurbishing park and recreational facilities; and
- Identifying priorities based upon needs and duration of needs.

The High Priority Park Improvement Priorities from the 2000 edition of the Parks & Recreation Element are listed below. As guides to park planning, it is appropriate that these priorities are included in this update of the Plan. Following each priority are examples of how the City of Las Vegas has addressed each priority since 2000, which also identifies where needs continue to exist:

- **Priority:** Develop neighborhood parks in areas with deficient service levels prior to the construction of other types of parks.
 - **Status:** As a result of the 2000 Parks & Recreation Element, the city undertook a building program to achieve 2.5 acres of park space per 1,000 residents. However, little attention has been given to where these parks are located and who they serve. As such, deficiencies exist as there are numerous pockets of residential development without nearby recreation amenities. This element strives to inventory this discrepancy and create policies to accomplish this priority.



*Charleston Heights and
Charleston Neighborhood Parks*

- **Priority:** Develop mini-parks/urban parks in high density areas prior to the development of other types of parks.
 - **Status:** Since 2000, three mini-parks/urban plazas have been funded and are currently under design. The park facilities, Centennial Plaza, Neon Boneyard Park and Boulder Plaza, are located in the urban core of downtown Las Vegas. However, since 2000, more parks have been built in newly developing areas in Centennial Hills and the Southwest than in the urban core of the Southeast. Park acreage in Centennial Hills has increased over 900% and the Southwest has increased more than 500%. This compares to the Southeast which only increased by approximately 7%.
- **Priority:** Increase recreational opportunities in areas of high density development to meet the minimum functional and demographic standards for high density areas.
 - **Status:** The aim of the Urban Pathways initiative is to satisfy the demand for central park features, including a proposed network of cultural and recreation pockets, linked by pedestrian corridors and trails. This network will provide the amenities that are found in traditional central parks, but will be located in a dispersed pattern throughout downtown. Many streetscape and urban plaza projects are in various stages of development and will implement the Urban Pathways vision for downtown Las Vegas. The status of those projects currently funded or in progress is contained in the following table.

Table I: Status of Urban Pathways Projects

PROJECT	STATUS
Boulder Plaza	Introduced at 9/27/07 Planning Commission meeting- proposed public sculpture park, located on a portion of the 5.38 acres on Boulder Avenue between First Street and Main Street
Casino Center Sidewalk and Art (Charleston to Colorado)	Design is complete; construction to start Fall 2007.
Cultural Corridor Trail	Pavement icons have been designed on behalf of the institutions of the Cultural Corridor; 60 percent drawings available 8/7/07; only 5' sidewalk to be provided (to be discussed with Griffin Structures); construction to start first quarter of 2008.
Entertainment Trail	SNPLMA funding denied; submitted as a CIP; \$200,000 available to complete sidewalk on 9th Street between Bridger and Clark; timeline and scope yet to be established
Hoover Sidewalk	Design completed January 2007; construction originally scheduled for March 2007; this project to bid with Casino Center project.
Neon Boneyard Park	60 percent design review meeting held on 8/21/07.

- **Priority:** Require that new residential development provide adequate neighborhood parks as development occurs.
 - **Status:** The City employs a number of strategies to encourage park construction as development occurs. These include: inclusion of a specified amount of park space in a negotiated development agreement for a master planned community, requiring that a percentage of R-PD (Residential Planned Development) projects be set aside as open space, and employing the use of BLM leases to provided park space in newly developed areas. However, there is little consistency with regard to insuring that neighborhood parks are built, and the current zoning code does not require the development of park space in all districts. The standardization of park provision is critical.
- **Priority:** Acquire land for neighborhood parks in existing but underserved areas prior to the provision of parks in areas with adequate park service.
 - **Status:** There are three mini-parks/urban plazas currently under development in the downtown core, and three park sites comprising 15 acres have been acquired for development along with a trail system along the Las Vegas Wash. All of these facilities are intended to increase park service in underserved areas.



*Children's Memorial
and Coleman Parks*

- **Priority:** Identify sites for regional, community parks and natural resource areas to secure adequate land area for regional and community park purposes prior to development of the surrounding area.
 - **Status:** As identified in Map 1, the City seeks Recreation and Public Purpose (R&PP) leases on vacant land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in anticipation of future park needs in the surrounding area. The City currently has 49 leases and 31 pending. A detailed discussion of the role of R&PP leases in park planning is contained in the History of Parks Planning and Construction in Las Vegas section of this document.
- **Priority:** Improve and renovate existing parks in underserved areas where land acquisition and development is unlikely prior to the development of new facilities in existing parks.
 - **Status:** Since 2000, completed and proposed renovations to existing parks include: improvements to Lorenzi Park, Jaycee Park and Freedom Park, the Dexter Park re-opening, the Ethel Pearson Park re-opening, and the James Gay, III Park re-opening. The city has received \$41,930,000 in funding from the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA) for the renovation of Lorenzi and Freedom parks, both located in mature areas of the city where it is difficult to acquire new park space. Both projects are in the design phase with anticipated completion in 2009 for Lorenzi Park and 2010 for Freedom Park.

PARK & LEISURE FACILITY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Policy 3.6.1 of the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan requires the city to establish a parks system based on parks classifications, park size requirements and service area standards. A park classification system is a way to organize and provide a standard terminology for the park and open space system. The classification system utilized by the city of Las Vegas is based on the guidelines established by the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) and local factors. Subcategories have been added by the city to address those facilities that fill the gaps between the one and five acre, and the five and thirty acre parks that are not addressed by the NRPA designations.

The city's park classification system is based on the following considerations:

- Size;
- Service area and characteristics of service population;
- Type and variety of developed recreational amenities;
- Programming needs of service populations; and
- Usage patterns.

PARK/FACILITY TYPES

Mini Park/Urban Plaza: A small park or plaza facility, with no more than one acre of land, and serving residents within one-quarter mile. Due to the limited service area of the mini park, they are only recommended in developed areas that have limited land available for neighborhood parks.

Neighborhood Park: A park that serves as the recreational and social focus of a neighborhood, with up to ten acres of land area, and serves those residents within one-half mile. This category has been expanded beyond the NRPA classification system to include smaller existing city parks that have between one and five acres of land.

Community Park: A park that serves a broader purpose than neighborhood parks, has from 30 to 50 acres of land area, and serves those residents within three miles. This category has been expended beyond the NRPA classification system to include smaller existing city parks that contain between ten and 30 acres of land.

Regional Park: A large park that meets the broad needs of the community, has over 50 acres of land area, and serves those residents within approximately eight miles.

School Park: A school playground and sports field that may be open for public use during times that the school is closed. For purposes of this plan, the service area for School Parks will be the same as that for Neighborhood Parks, or one-half mile.

Special Use Park/Facility: A park or facility with a very specific use which is generally oriented for a specific purpose. Examples include, but are not limited to: equestrian parks, extreme sports parks, dog parks, motocross tracks, and competitive tennis facilities. The standard amenities vary depending upon the specific type of park/facility. Recreation trends identified by ongoing public needs assessments may also indicate demand for new special use parks/facilities. These facilities serve the entire community and do not have size or service area requirements of their own. For tracking purposes, their acreage and/or square footage is categorized in the appropriate park/facility classification.



*Craigin, Darling Tennis Center
Facilities, Sammy Davis Jr.
Festival Plaza and Dexter Parks*

Table 2 : Park Categories

Park Facilities			
Park Classification	Acreage	Service Area	Amenities
Mini-Park	Less than 1 acre	Less than 1/4 mile	N/A
Neighborhood Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local designation NRPA designation 	1-5 acres 5-10 acres	1/4 mile to 1/2 mile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-site parking Restrooms Half-street improvements along one side of the property.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 50% natural turf, 35% plants and desert landscape, 15% asphalt and concrete. Shade structures Standard site furniture, drinking fountain, signage, parking and pathway lighting, trash enclosure, vehicle gates, and irrigation controls. One or two amenities such as bocce, horseshoes or basketball. Optional amenities such as community gardens, memorials, art sculptures, splash pads, etc. A tot lot with fabric shade.
Community Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local designation NRPA designation 	10-30 acres 30-50 acres	1/2 mile to 3 miles	<i>Amenities found in a Neighborhood Park plus:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sports fields Sports Courts Optional amenities such as amphitheatres or skateboarding areas
Regional Park	>50 acres	Entire community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same amenities found in a Community Park Optional amenities such as amphitheatres or skateboarding areas
School Park	Variable	1/2 Mile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Playground Sports fields Sports Courts
Special Use Park	Variable	N/A	Dependent on Use of Park

LEISURE SERVICE FACILITIES

The city's Leisure Services facilities classification system is based on the following considerations:

- Facility square footage;
- Characteristics of service population;
- Type and variety of developed recreational amenities;
- Programming needs of service populations; and
- Usage patterns.

Neighborhood Center: A Leisure Service Facility designed with multiple types of programming space that can be used for a variety of general recreational, social, performing and visual arts and educational activities. Neighborhood Centers should be between 20,000 and 30,000 square feet and service approximately 10,000 residents.

Community Center: A Leisure Service facility designed to serve the citizens' recreational, social, performing and visual arts and educational needs beyond the immediate neighborhood and to a wider community audience. These centers are generally located adjacent to a community park, are about 30,000 to 55,000 square feet in size, and service approximately 25,000 residents.

Regional Center: A Leisure Service facility designed to offer a wider range of leisure services than the smaller Neighborhood and Community Centers. A regional center would typically serve several communities and be centrally located for regional use. Ideally, it should be located in conjunction with a larger park and/or swimming pool facility. These centers are at least 55,000 square feet in area and serve approximately 75,000 residents.

Community School: A Community School offers a range of recreational, social performing and visual arts and educational activities, provides opportunities that strengthen and support schools, communities, families and students. The City generally owns and operates a modular office on the school site for before and after school programming that utilizes the school site's gymnasium, classrooms, and other district-owned amenities.

Aquatic Center: An aquatic center typically offers both recreational swimming (lap swimming and swim lessons), competitive swimming and training rooms, and cardiovascular strength rooms. Associated amenities will include locker rooms, showers, and office space. An aquatic center may be located in conjunction with another park or facility, but can also be located independently as a stand-alone facility.



*Doolittle and
Durango Hills Parks*

Table 3 : Leisure Facility Categories

Recreational Facilities			
Facility Type	Size	Service Area	Amenities
Neighborhood Center	20,000–30,000+ SF	10,000 residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lounge and lobby ▪ Offices ▪ Multipurpose rooms ▪ Game room ▪ Kitchen ▪ Restrooms ▪ Gymnasium, showers and locker rooms (unless provided at an adjacent facility) ▪ Conference room
Community Center	30,000-55,000 SF	25,000 residents	<i>Amenities found in a Neighborhood Center plus:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dance studio ▪ Gymnastics room ▪ Cardio/strength training room ▪ Instructor center
Regional Center	>55,000+ SF	75,000 residents	<i>Amenities found in a Community Center plus:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indoor or outdoor pool ▪ Indoor walk/jog track ▪ Auxiliary gymnasium ▪ Computer lab
Community School	Variable	Variable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modular office ▪ Multi-purpose classrooms ▪ Playground ▪ Playing fields ▪ Gymnasium ▪ Track ▪ Cafeteria space/lunchroom
Aquatic Center	Variable	Variable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Locker rooms ▪ Restrooms ▪ Lobby ▪ Showers ▪ Office space ▪ Classrooms ▪ Cardiovascular strength space
Special Use Facility	Variable	Variable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Speciality use area based on public interest, such as performing arts theatre, ballroom, indoor walking track, music room, arts & crafts room, pottery room, weaving room, art gallery, etc.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

PLANNING CONTEXT

This section evaluates the existing regulatory framework, plans and trends relating to parks and recreation in the City of Las Vegas. It presents a summary of legislation and land use plans applicable to the City's park planning process and includes an inventory of parks and leisure service facilities.

POLICY FRAMEWORK

All levels of government factor into the discussion of parks. A summary of federal, state, regional, and local policies related to recreation are discussed below.

FEDERAL

SNPLMA: In 1998 Congress enacted the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA) to authorize the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to dispose of public land. A portion of land sales proceeds may be used for conservation and the development of parks, trails and natural areas by local and federal agencies. The City accesses these funds through a competitive application process.

Red Rock National Conservation Area Resource

Management Plan: The primary purpose of the Management Plan is to conserve and protect the natural resources in Red Rock, while giving the public opportunities to recreate and enjoy and appreciate nature. The plan creates a management plan for the Red Rock National Conservation Area, which addresses and updates management policy for the present and future needs of Red Rock Canyon. By virtue of its proximity to Las Vegas, this natural reservation area provides unique recreational opportunities to residents and visitors and greatly enhances the portfolio of parks and leisure facilities provided by the city.

STATE

Nevada's 2003 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP): The plan examines the overall recreational needs and issues statewide and creates a strategic action plan for increasing and improving the quality of outdoor recreation opportunities in Nevada. The top three issues regarding outdoor recreation in Nevada are:

- Public access to public lands for diverse outdoor recreation;
- Funding parks and recreation; and
- Recreational trails and pathways



*Mary Dutton and
Elkhorn Parks*

The Assessment and Policy Plan found that there is a high rate of outdoor activity participation among Nevadans. Also, there is strong support in Nevada for conservation of natural and wilderness areas, historic sites and cultural resources. The SCORP plan can assist in identifying areas for open space, parks and trails planning in the Las Vegas area.

REGIONAL

The Southern Nevada Regional Policy Plan: The plan implements a state requirement for communities in the Las Vegas Valley to work in conjunction with one another to produce a regional policy plan. The plan consists of regional planning policy guidelines that are recognized by the local governments. It specifies seven topics to be addressed through regional planning, listed as follows:

- Conservation, open space and natural resources;
- Air quality;
- Infill development;
- Population forecast;
- Land use;
- Public facilities; and
- Transportation

The Regional Open Space Plan, adopted in 2006, focuses on strategies for conserving open space in Southern Nevada. The plan encourages open space in the City that consists of passive neighborhood spaces, not active parks, where people can find solace, quiet and perhaps a view of the mountain backdrop. The plan contains a Recommended Open Space System, which includes five open space elements that create guidelines for conservation in Southern Nevada.

LOCAL

Recreational and Transportation Trails Elements: The Recreation and Transportation Trails Elements of the Las Vegas Master Plan 2020, originally adopted in 2002 and updated in 2005, establish standards, guidelines, objectives, policies and priorities for the location, development and maintenance of the trail systems. Both the Recreational and Transportation Trails Elements pertain to trails categorized as equestrian, multi-use, on-street and off-street trails. The intent of the plan is to link open spaces, parks and natural areas, as well as delineate opportunities to extend trail systems during the next 20 years.

The implementation of these elements is being achieved in two ways: construction of trail segments by developers or property owners as part of a site development plan; and construction by the City of Las Vegas as part of a capital improvement project. Currently, the procedure for determining the latter projects that will be sponsored as part of the CIP begins

at the management level. Upper-level staff meets prior to the submittal period for capital projects to brainstorm and select projects for submittal to the CIP committee. Factors considered when prioritizing projects include, but are not limited to:

- 1.) Other sources of funding available for the project;
- 2.) Potential political support for the project;
- 3.) Approved funding for the project in previous budget cycles; and
- 4.) Inclusion in the master list of proposed projects contained in the Master Plan.

City of Las Vegas/Clark County Interlocal Parks

Agreement: The Interlocal Agreement between the City of Las Vegas and Clark County, adopted in January of 2002, establishes joint policies on annexations, transportation planning, land use planning, corporate boundaries, parks and trails planning, and urban services. The agreement created a new set of plans for parks and recreational trails and for the creation of a joint recreational trails map. The agreement also states specific coordinated roadway designs that provide ample shoulder space for future non-motorized uses.

Northwest Open Space Plan: The Northwest Open Space Plan was approved by the City Council in January 2005. The plan provides a policy framework for creating an open space system in the northwest area of the City, comprised of the following four components:

- Protection of natural systems
- Active recreational landscapes
- Historic and cultural landscapes
- Contiguous open space corridors

Implementation of the Northwest Open Space Plan includes conservation of land for parks, open space and trails. The location of land to be set aside should create a “hub and spoke” system that uses trails and open space corridors to connect parks and open areas. Parks should be located in concert with trails and open space to create a system that is easily accessible by pedestrians and cyclists throughout the City. The Parks & Recreation Element provides a regulatory framework for implementing the active recreational landscapes component of the open space system.

Equestrian Park Master Plan: The Equestrian Park Master Plan investigates the feasibility of building an equestrian park in the Northwest. The plan outlines data to determine the need for a park, evaluates other equestrian parks, provides a master plan for the site, recommends a funding and phasing plan for construction of the park, and defines operations and management programs for the park. Due to the number of flexible and multi-use facilities being proposed, the Equestrian Park will be able to host a wide variety of equine events.



*W. Charleston Lion/Essex
and Equestrian Parks*

Floyd Lamb Master Plan: Floyd Lamb Park, previously owned and managed by the State of Nevada, was transferred to the City of Las Vegas on July 1, 2007. The park currently supports passive recreational activities such as fishing, hiking, picnicking, and equestrian facilities. The City of Las Vegas plan for Floyd Lamb Park includes two additional lakes, a loop road, visitors center, archeological museum, mountain bike trails, memorial garden, pedestrian and equestrian trails, picnic areas, historic buildings area, and two environmental enhancement areas.

EXISTING FACILITIES

A main component of this element is an inventory of existing parks and recreational facilities. In this section, information is presented citywide and by planning sector, and includes all park space and recreational facilities falling within one of the categories outlined in the Park Classification System section of this element.

As of December 2006, the City of Las Vegas owns and operates 1,745 acres of park space. Given the City's estimated population of 591,536 in 2006, this yields a service level of approximately 3.0 acres per 1,000 persons, which exceeds the standard adopted in 2000 of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents. Overall, the City has increased its service level from 1.1 acres per 1,000 residents in 2000. This has been accomplished by increasing the number of city parks from 40 to 69 over the same time period.

Although standards and service levels are intended to measure the city's progress in serving the recreational needs of its citizens, in order to create a complete picture of the city's park system, other types of park space that add to and complement the city's system should also be addressed. Recreational facilities provided by the Clark County School District (CCSD), along with privately-owned parks and golf courses all add to the recreational opportunities available to Las Vegas residents. Privately-owned parks and golf courses are shown on Map 5.

A joint policy called Open Schools Open Doors, between the Clark County School District and the city of Las Vegas guarantees that some schools with park and leisure facilities will be accessible to the general public outside of school hours. Also, there are a number of parks that are privately maintained by developers or community associations (e.g. parks in the Summerlin and Peccole Ranch master planned communities) that are open to the general public. The table below shows the park acreage of the aforementioned types of parks and resulting service level.

Table 4 : Park Acreage & Service Levels

Current Park Service Levels		
	Total Acres	Acres/1,000 population
City Parks	1,745	3.0
School Parks	819.9	1.4
Private Parks	380.6	.06
Private Golf Courses	1,837.7	3.1
Public Golf Courses	642.2	1.1
Park Service Levels, City of Las Vegas, Totals	4,595.4	9.2

The inventory includes 69 parks encompassing 1,745 acres, and 36 leisure service facilities operated by the city and community partners with a total of 542,429 square feet as shown in Map 1.

City of Las Vegas (Map 1)

Demographics:

- 2006 Population: 591,536
- Projected 2010 Population: 665,591
- Projected 2020 population: 781,396
- Projected 2030 population: 802,066



*Firefighters Memorial,
Fitzgerald Tot Lot Parks*

Table 5 : Parks & Leisure Services Facilities Citywide

Classification	Number	Size	Smallest Facility	Largest Facility
Parks				
Mini Park/Urban Plaza	3	1.88 acres	Mary Dutton Park (.2 acre)	Fitzgeralds Tot Lot (.86 acre)
Neighborhood Parks	53	391.4 acres	Frank Wright Plaza (1.01 acres)	Centennial Hills Park (22 acres)
Community Parks	7	239.83 acres	Rainbow Family Park (26.48 acres)	All American Park (45 acres)
Regional Parks	6	1079.89 acres	Bettye Willson Soccer Complex (58.33 acres)	Floyd Lamb Park (680 acres)
School Parks	74			
Special Use Parks	3			
Total	146	1,713 acres		
Leisure Facilities				
Neighborhood Centers	10	69,891 SF	Derfelt Senior Citizens Center – Lorenzi Park (2,105 SF)	Las Vegas Senior Center (17,689 SF)
Community Centers	9	244,281 SF	Sammy Davis Jr. Festival Plaza – Lorenzi Park (6,346 SF)	East Las Vegas Community/Senior Center (40,000 SF)
Regional Centers	5	207,617 SF	Charleston Heights Art Center (25,540 SF)	Centennial Hills Leisure Service Center (98,385 SF)
Community Schools	10	20,640 SF	Multiple (1,440 SF)	Multiple (4,480 SF)
Aquatic Centers	8			
Total	42	542,429 SF		

Southeast Sector (Map 4)

Demographics:

- 2006 Population: 224,684
- Projected 2010 Population: 224,264
- Projected 2020 population: 225,910
- Projected 2030 population: 225,910

Table 6 : Parks & Leisure Services Facilities Southeast Sector

Classification	Number	Size	Smallest Facility	Largest Facility
Parks				
Mini Park/Urban Plaza	3	1.88 acres	Mary Dutton Park (.2 acre)	Fitzgeralds Tot Lot (.86 acre)
Neighborhood Parks	23	134.35 acres	Frank Wright Plaza (1.01 acres)	Jaycee Park (18.4 acres)
Community Parks	1	32.13 acres	Ed Fountain Park (32.13 acres)	Ed Fountain Park (32.13 acres)
Regional Parks	2	130.96 acres	Lorenzi Park (59.37 acres)	Freedom Park (71.59 acres)
School Parks	36			
Special Use Parks	0			
Total	65	299.32 acres		
Leisure Facilities				
Neighborhood Centers	10	62,590 SF	Derfelt Senior Citizens Center – Lorenzi Park (2,105 SF)	Las Vegas Senior Center (17,689 SF)
Community Centers	8	179,528 SF	Sammy Davis Jr. Festival Plaza – Lorenzi Park (6,346 SF)	East Las Vegas Community/Senior Center (40,000 SF)
Regional Centers	2	56,935 SF	Charleston Heights Art Center (25,540 SF)	Doolittle Community Center (31,395 SF)
Community Schools	4	11,840 SF	Multiple (1,440 SF)	Multiple (4,480 SF)
Aquatic Centers	5			
Total	29	310,893 SF		

Southwest Sector (Map 3)

Demographics:

- 2006 Population: 206,688
- Projected 2010 Population: 240,169
- Projected 2020 population: 279,666
- Projected 2030 population: 279,666

Table 7 : Parks & Leisure Services Facilities Southwest Sector

Classification	Number	Size	Smallest Facility	Largest Facility
Parks				
Mini Park/Urban Plaza	0			
Neighborhood Parks	14	105.78 acres	Cameron Community Park (1.1 acres)	Pioneer Park (17 acres)
Community Parks	3	101.48 acres	Rainbow Family Park (26.48 acres)	All American Park (45 acres)
Regional Parks	2	166.33 acres	Bettye Wilson Sports Complex (58.33)	Kellogg Zaher Sports Complex (108 acres)
School Parks	19			
Special Use Parks	1			
Total	39	373.59 acres		
Leisure Facilities				
Neighborhood Centers	1	2,400 SF	Johnson Track Break Center	Johnson Track Break Center
Community Centers	0			
Regional Centers	2	41,147 SF	Hills Ampitheater	Veteran's Memorial Leisure Center
Community Schools	3	4,320 SF	Multiple (1,440 SF)	Multiple (1,440 SF)
Aquatic Centers	1			
Total	7	47,867 SF		

Centennial Hills Sector (Map 2)

Demographics:

- 2006 Population: 160,164
- Projected 2010 Population: 201,158
- Projected 2020 population: 275,820
- Projected 2030 population: 296,489

*Freedom and Ed Foley Parks*

Table 8 : Parks & Leisure Services Facilities Centennial Hills Sector

Classification	Number	Size	Smallest Facility	Largest Facility
Parks				
Mini Park/Urban Plaza	0			
Neighborhood Parks	16	151.27 acres	Cimarron Rose (2.5 acres)	Centennial Hills (22 acres)
Community Parks	3	106.22 acres	Mountain Ridge (32.37 acres)	Buckskin Basin (39.17 acres)
Regional Parks	12	782.6 acres	Alexander Hualapai (102.6 acres)	Floyd Lamb Park (680 acres)
School Parks	19			
Special Use Parks	2			
Total	52	1,040.09 acres		
Leisure Facilities				
Neighborhood Centers	2	5,745 SF	Cimarron Rose Community Center (2,408 SF)	Northwest Senior Center (3,337 SF)
Community Centers	1	41,147 SF	Durango Hills Leisure Services Center–YMCA (41,147 SF)	Durango Hills Leisure Services Center–YMCA (41,147 SF)
Regional Centers	1	98,385 SF	Centennial Community and Active Adult Center (98,385 SF)	Centennial Community and Active Adult Center (98,385 SF)
Community Schools	2	8,960 SF	Lied Community School (4,480 SF)	Molasky Community School (4,480 SF)
Aquatic Centers	2			
Total	8	154,237 SF		

EXISTING FACILITIES

Currently, the City owns and operates the buildings and facilities used for recreational purposes as shown in Table 9. Definitions of each facility type can be found in the Background section.

A table displaying all existing parks and leisure services centers, along with a detailed inventory of amenities and activities found at each park or center is found in the appendix. This table includes location, ward, year of construction, amount of turf, sports fields and courts, equestrian facilities, etc. Also included is information on parks currently under construction, as well as proposed parks.

Table 9 : Leisure Services Facilities/Centers Citywide

Leisure Services Facilities				
Name	Type	Location	Const. Year	Facility Size (Sq. Ft.)
Becker Community School	Community School	9110 Hillpointe Rd.	1991	1,440
Bill & Lillie Heinrich YMCA	Community Center	4141 Meadows Ln.	1980 Renovated 2004	6,900
Brinley Community School	Community School	6150 Smoke Ranch Rd.	1968	1,440
Centennial Hills Community & Active Adult Center	Regional Center	6601 N. Buffalo Dr	2007	98,000
Charleston Heights Arts Center	Neighborhood Center	800 S. Brush St.	1978	25,540
Charleston Heights Community School	Community School	6438 Celeste Ave.	2004	4,480
Chuck Minker Sports Complex	Community Center	275 N. Mojave Rd.	1980	36,365
Cimarron Rose Community Center	Neighborhood Center	Ann/Cimarron	2000	3,964
Clark Community School	Community School	3074 Arville St.	2002	4,480
Darling Tennis Center	Regional Center	7901 W. Washington Ave.	2005	10,406
Derfelt Senior Center	Neighborhood Center	3343 W. Washington Ave.	1983	2,105
Doolittle Community Center	Regional Center	1950 N. J St.	1965	64,000
Doolittle Senior Center	Neighborhood Center	1930 N. J St.	1998	7,476
Downtown Senior Services Center	Neighborhood Center	310 S. 9th Street	2006	3,600
Dula Gym	Regional Center	441 E. Bonanza Rd	1954	18,750

Table 9, continued

Leisure Services Facilities				
Name	Type	Location	Const. Year	Facility Size (Sq. Ft.)
Durango Hills Community Center YMCA	Community Center	3521 N. Durango Dr.	1999	41,147
East Las Vegas Community Center	Community Center	250 N. Eastern Ave	2002	40,000
Gibson Community School	Community School	3990 W. Washington Ave.	2002	1,440
Hills Amphitheater	Regional Center	Deer Springs & Durango Dr.	1993	11,150
Johnson Community School	Community School	340 Villa Monterey Dr.	1994	1,440
Johnson Track Break Center	Neighborhood Center	330 Villa Monterey Dr.	1997	2,400
Las Vegas Senior Citizens Center	Neighborhood Center	451 E. Bonanza Rd	1954	624
Las Vegas Sports Park	Community Center	1400 N. Rampart Blvd.		
Lieburn Senior Center	Neighborhood Center	6230 Garwood Ave	2003	7,700
Lied Community School	Community School	5340 W. Tropical Parkway	2003	4,706
Lorenzi Adaptive Recreation & Outreach Center	Neighborhood Center	3339 W. Washington Ave	1983	2,420
Mirabelli Community Center	Community Center	6200 Elton Dr	2006	30,616
Molasky Community School	Community School	7801 W. Gilmore Ave.	2006	4,480
Northwest Senior Center	Neighborhood Center	6841 Lone Mountain Rd	1976	4,400.
Rafael Rivera Community Center	Community Center	2850 Stewart Ave	1995	7,116
Reed Whipple Cultural Center	Community Center	821 Las Vegas Blvd. N.	1963	32,510
Robison Community School	Community School	4794 Harris Ave.	1994	1,440
Sammy Davis Jr. Festival Plaza	Regional Center	720 Twin Lakes Dr.	1950s	6,346
Stupak Community Center	Neighborhood Center	300 W. Boston Ave	1954	4,800
Veteran's Memorial Leisure Services Center	Regional Center	101 S. Pavilion Center Dr	1999	41,147
West Las Vegas Arts Center	Community Center	947 Lake Mead Dr.	1994	7,601
TOTAL	36			542,429
<i>Neighborhood Center TOTAL¹</i>	22			
<i>Community Center TOTAL</i>	9			
<i>Regional Center TOTAL</i>	5			

¹ For purposes of service level analysis and because Community Schools offer comparable programming to Neighborhood Centers, Community Schools are counted as Neighborhood Centers in this total.

Table 10 : Aquatic Centers Citywide

Aquatic Center Facilities				
Name	Type	Location	Const. Year	Pool Surface Area (Sq. Ft.)
Baker Pool	6-lane, 25-yard outdoor pool	1100 E. Saint Louis Ave	1993	4,500
Doolittle Pool	Outdoor play pool with zero-depth entry	1950 N. J St.	2003	5,655
Municipal Pool	50-meter, 25-yard indoor heated pool	431 E. Bonanza Ave	1999	11,842
Carlos L. Martinez and Darrio J. Hall Family Pool at Freedom Park	6-lane, 25-yard outdoor play and competitive pool with zero-depth entry	889 N. Pecos Rd.	2006	7,442
Garside Pool	6-lane, 25-yard outdoor pool; 1 wading pool	300 S. Torrey Pines Dr	1971	4,892 swim and 225 wading
Pavilion Center Pool	50-meter, 25-yard outdoor pool	101 N. Pavilion Center Dr	2002	12,000
Durango Hills Community Center/ YMCA Pool	8-lane, 25-yard outdoor pool	3521 N. Durango Dr.	1999	N/A
Centennial Hills Community Center/ YMCA Pool	1 indoor 6-lane, 26-yard lap pool; 1 indoor teaching pool; 1 outdoor play pool; 1 outdoor swim pool (4)	6601 N. Buffalo Dr.	2007	5,350 outdoor swim 2,414 outdoor play 600 indoor teaching 3,570 indoor lap
Total	12 pools at 8 centers			58,490 SF

Opened in 2007, a 98,000-square foot community center located on 18 acres in Centennial Hills Community and Active Adult Center is the city's largest center, and will provide a variety of recreational activities such as indoor and outdoor swimming pools, two gymnasiums, an active adult center, and space for a variety of multi-generational activities. A public arts component is incorporated into the facility

PROPOSED FACILITIES

The proposed Ed Fountain Park center and the Stupak Community Center rebuilding will provide a much needed expansion of services for their respective communities. The proposed 45,000 square-foot Ed Fountain Park Community Center will include a gymnasium, fitness room, multi-purpose rooms, and will consolidate the senior and adaptive divisions currently located within several buildings located throughout nearby Lorenzi Park. The Stupak Community Center will replace the existing center, which will be demolished and eventually replaced with a pocket park. The proposed 34,000 square-foot center will include a gym with walk/jog track and a number of multi-purpose rooms providing a variety of recreational, arts and educational programs that serve the community's needs. The Mirabelli Community Center rebuild project consisting of the construction of a 31,000 square-foot community center and the demolition of an existing 8,000 square-foot building has been completed. The Pavilion Pool enclosure will allow for the year-round use of the existing pool facilities. The Doolittle Senior Center expansion will add approximately 4,000 square feet to the existing center and will provide space for a multi-purpose room, game room, and extra storage.



*James Gay III and
Garhime Heights Parks*

Table II : Proposed Leisure Services Facilities

Proposed Leisure Facilities					
Proposed Facility	Budget Year	Estimated Square-footage	Location	Funding Source	Estimated Completion Date
Ed Fountain Park Community Center	2007-2011	45,000	Decatur/Vegas	Unfunded	2011
Stupak Community Center	2007	34,000	300 W. Boston Ave	CDBG	2009
Pavilion Pool Enclosure	2010	N/A	101 N. Pavilion Center Dr	RTC Funds	2008
Doolittle Senior Center Expansion	2008	4,000	1950 N. J St	Grants	2008
Garside Pool & Bathhouse Replacement	2007-2011	7,200	300 S. Torrey Pines Dr	Unfunded	2011

OTHER PARK AND LEISURE SERVICE FACILITIES

This inventory is intended to document city-owned and maintained facilities. As mentioned in the Background section of this element, there are a number of other types of parks and leisure service facilities that also serve city residents. Map 5 depicts all privately controlled park space and golf courses that provide recreational opportunities within the city. Map 8 displays school parks that are accessible to the general public outside of school hours.

TRENDS

Parks and leisure service activities are a reflection of the needs and desires of the larger population. As the city continues to grow, in both area and number of residents, demands on the park system will change. Today, parks are experiencing a resurgence in popularity. A growing amount of research and literature focuses on the positive impacts of parks on communities and the lives of residents. The city must stay aware of and respond to national and local trends to improve quality of life and to ensure that funds spent on parks are not being used on facilities that are likely to become outdated in the near future. This subsection explores trends in parks and leisure service activities and their potential impacts on the city of Las Vegas.

HEALTHY LIFESTYLES AND COMMUNITY DESIGN

With over 60 percent of the adult population overweight² and rising rates of diabetes and heart disease, public health researchers and urban planning professionals are exploring the link between community design and health. Most believe that even moderate physical activity can improve overall health. Studies are now examining the environmental reasons why an increasing number of people are not getting the recommended amount of activity.

A growing body of research has produced preliminary findings that the design of our cities creates barriers to physical activity. A study by the Saint Louis University School of Public Health published in the American Journal of Preventative Medicine has identified the top factors that influence individual's activity levels. They are as follows:

- Land use – a mix of uses increase a person's desire to be active. Hiking and biking trails and crosswalks promote walking and bike use.

² Center for Disease Control U.S. Obesity Trends 1985-2000

- Transportation – mass transit encourages healthy lifestyles because people are forced to walk to and from stops.
- Aesthetics – people are more inclined to walk when there is a well-maintained environment with interesting things to see (historic monuments, attractions, etc.)
- Institutional and organizational policies – encouraging physical activity in parks, recreational systems, schools and the workplace promote an active lifestyle.
- Promotions – media campaigns build awareness of the importance of physical activity and can increase movement.
- Public policies – policies, such as appropriating funds for construction of bike lanes, walking trails, parks and recreational amenities, promote activity-friendly infrastructure.
- Travel patterns – people are more likely to walk or bike to work if they see others doing the same thing.³

The city of Las Vegas recognizes the importance of a healthy citizenry. One priority of the city's strategic plan is to promote healthy lifestyles for all segments of the community. The city has also enacted policies to address the connection between the built environment and public health. The Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND) zoning district encourages many of the factors listed above, including a mix of uses, mass transit and connection of neighborhoods by sidewalks and trails. The Department of Leisure Services promotes healthy lifestyles with media campaigns and recreational programming.

In an effort to increase quality of life standards, including health, recreational, arts and cultural activities, the city of Las Vegas designed and constructed community centers in the Durango Hills and Centennial Hills areas of the city. Increasing budgets and decreasing revenues were some of the factors identified when the City Council made the decision to partner with a private, non-profit corporation for the management of the Durango Hills and Centennial Hills Community Centers. The city utilized a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to advertise to eligible organizations and implemented panels consisting of subject matter experts to ensure the most appropriate organization was chosen.

The Young Mens Christian Association (YMCA) applied and was chosen to manage the Durango Hills Community Center and has been successful in operating this facility for nearly a decade. Recently, with the construction of the Centennial Hills Community Center, the city once again published an RFP for qualified, eligible organizations. The YMCA successfully bid for the management opportunity and is now managing both the Durango Hills and Centennial Hills Community Centers.

3 American Journal of Preventive Medicine



*Gilcrease Brothers and
Polly Gonzales Parks*

The successful partnership allows the city to commit resources to other essential government services while the YMCA is able to enhance the community by providing health, recreational, arts and cultural activities ranging from swimming lessons and summer camps to organized sports and arts and crafts. Contracts with the YMCA ensure the city has an active role in managing the success of both community centers and the partnership is beneficial for the city, the YMCA, and the residents in the Las Vegas valley.

OPEN SPACE AND TRAILS

Urban parks have a long history in the United States as places to escape the city, relax, play and socialize. However, the field of parks and recreation is expanding and there is a growing recognition that a complete park system must include other types of spaces, such as trails, to link parks to neighborhoods and open space to protect natural resources.

In 2004, as part of the Northwest Open Space Plan, the city of Las Vegas conducted a Community Attitude and Interest Survey to help establish priorities for the planning of parks, trails, open space area and outdoor recreational facilities in Northwest Las Vegas. Findings from the survey indicate that interest in open space and trails is increasing in relation to more traditional park and recreation activities. In terms of need and importance to respondents, walking and biking trails ranked at the top of the list. Respondents also support the funding of parks and trails when compared to other priorities for the Northwest. Eighty-six percent (86%) responding said that it is either very important (42%) or somewhat important (44%) for the city of Las Vegas to fund outdoor parks, trails and recreational facilities.

PRIVATE/PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS

Cities across the country are experimenting with private public partnerships, also known as “concessions” and “outsourcing,” for some of their park and recreation operations. These arrangements are most successful with specialized, revenue-generating facilities, such as golf courses, stadiums and restaurants. In those instances, it is often more economical for a local government to contract with an outside operator than to run the facility itself. While this concept is in its infancy, it has been embraced at varying levels by city governments around the country.

In addition to partnerships with the private sector, there are also opportunities for mutually beneficial relationships between a local government and a non-profit organization. The

Trust for Public Land has identified four factors that must be in place for these partnerships to succeed:

- There must be an open process and contracts must be bid properly;
- To compete with private interest, facilities must be as good as or better than competitors;
- Fee structure must be appropriate for the location, service and competition; and
- Agency oversight is essential.⁴

The city has some experience with private/public partnerships. The Angel Park Golf Course is operated by a for-profit company although the land is owned by the city of Las Vegas. While not appropriate in all situations, private/public partnerships are an important alternative for the provision of parks and leisure services. The city may choose to enter into an agreement for various reasons, including the generation of revenue by charging a fee for the use of a city-owned facility. Private/public partnerships may also result in a cost savings if the city does not have to hire specialized staff to operate a particular type of facility.

COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION

The benefits of parks are traditionally described in qualitative terms. Parks consistently appear in quality of life surveys as important factors for residents. Historically, parks have been touted as peaceful retreats from the bustling, often crowded city and, in the absence of yards, as places for urban dwellers to get exercise and recreation.

However, the role parks play in communities is not limited by physical constraints or stereotypical ideas about their function. A number of cities are using parks to revitalize aging commercial districts and neighborhoods alike. The National Parks and Recreation Association recognizes this trend in its national agenda by stating that “urban parks and recreation stimulate community and economic development.”⁵

Downtown Las Vegas is currently experiencing renewed interest and increasing revitalization. There are mixed-use and residential high-rise projects under construction and many more are planned. There are currently 8,193 residents in downtown and 2.91 existing park acres for a service level of .355 park acres per 1,000 residents. Planned park projects, several of which are already under design, will increase the acreage to 4.04. The resulting service level will be .493, significantly below the adopted citywide standard of 2.5. With the aforementioned condominium development, additional residents will create even greater demand for park services.

⁴ Trust for Public Land *Conserving Land for People “Outsourcing”*

⁵ National Parks and Recreation Association. *A Call To Action: A National Agenda for Urban Parks and Recreation in America.*



Hadland and Heers Parks

FUNDING SOURCES

The city derives funds for parks and recreational purposes, including the acquisition, development, and operations and maintenance of parks, recreational facilities, and programs from a number of sources. The major existing revenue sources along with a detailed explanation of each are listed below.

GENERAL TAX REVENUE

This revenue source is one of the largest sources of funding for parks and recreational purposes. This revenue is derived primarily from the imposition of sales taxes and property taxes. It should be noted that these funds are variable, constituting a guaranteed annual amount for parks and recreation, and that there are many competing demands for this fluctuating funding source.

SOUTHERN NEVADA PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT ACT

With the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA), passed in 1998, an important option entered the funding equation. Each year, Southern Nevada entities submit proposals to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The BLM then allocates funds received from large federal land auctions to those projects scoring sufficiently high based on a pre-determined ranking system. Since its inception, the city of Las Vegas has received \$196,618,000 in funding from the SNPLMA coffers for park renovation, trailhead and trails development, parkland acquisition, construction of new parks and community recreation centers.

RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION TAX

The Residential Construction Tax (RCT) is derived from new residential development according to a formula established by the Nevada Revised Statutes that is equivalent to one percent of the construction value of a residential structure up to a ceiling of \$1,000. The construction value is set at 36 cents per square foot in accordance with the western building schedule of valuation. The RCT is collected in funds, as undeveloped land, or as developed parks in lieu of funds or land.

GRANTS

The federal government offers grants in the form of Community Development Block Grants (CDBG). These funds are available for the development of parks, but they are usually of a limited amount and have qualifying constraints that

limit their applicability. The Stupak Community Center and the Doolittle Senior Center expansion are examples of facilities employing CDBG funding as part of their financing structure.

Other grants are available but are limited in use specifically for trail development. One such grant is the TEA-21 grant administered by the Regional Transportation Commission.

LAS VEGAS CONVENTION AND VISITORS' AUTHORITY

The Las Vegas Convention and Visitors' Authority provides a voluntary annual grant to the city that is used for parks purposes. It should be noted that this is a voluntary contribution on the part of the Authority and not a guaranteed source of funds.

BONDING

Bonds for recreational purposes currently take many forms. Recently, the City Council approved a medium-term bond which does not require voter approval. It is backed with a two percent property tax increase. This \$25 million bond will finance recreational improvements, new construction, and completion of construction of 11 separate recreational facilities. The bond is to be repaid within a 10-year horizon.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE ARRANGEMENTS

Public/private arrangements can be very beneficial sources of funding. However, acceptance and utilization of private monetary or in-kind contributions must ensure access to parks and recreational facilities by the general public.

GIFTS

Gifts of land or money designated for parks purposes have provided a source of funding in the past, but such gifts should be unfettered and unrestricted, and the application of names to a park or facility recognizing a benefactor or family must follow approved city policy.

FUND RAISERS

Fund raising has been done for a very limited number of minor projects. Such funds are generally directed toward facility development rather than for land acquisition.



*Hills, Heritage,
Huntridge Circle and
Indian Hills Parks*

ANALYSIS

This section provides an analysis of parks and leisure service facilities within Las Vegas by using an approach that includes both quantitative and qualitative measures. This comprehensive approach ensures an objective assessment of the park system. This section contains:

- a **level of service analysis** to project the amount of park acreage needed to accommodate the City's population through 2030;
- a **spatial analysis** to identify gaps in the system and to monitor the equitable distribution of parks throughout the City;
- a **needs assessment** to identify existing surpluses or deficiencies in types of parks and recreations facilities, and the issues and priorities that are important to residents; and
- a **functional analysis** to determine the amenities (fields, courts, etc) that will be needed and to set a standard for the provision of future amenities.

The Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan divides the City into three sectors. Each sector represents a geographical area of the City and each sector has its own unique characteristics and needs. The three sectors are identified as the Southeast Sector, the Southwest Sector and the Centennial Hills Sector. Where appropriate, data is shown citywide and by sector.

Assumptions

Within this document, citywide statistics and analysis use the 2006 City of Las Vegas population estimate and the acreage of city owned/maintained parks. This element is intended to document the existing conditions and guide the future development of city owned/maintained parks. However, as discussed in previous sections, the city uses a variety of methods to provide parks.

LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

A level of service standard is a critical component of park planning. The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) provides recommended guidelines and standards, but also suggests that local communities develop level of service standards that reflect their own unique characteristics.

In 1998, the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority (SNSPA), which was the precursor to the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC), completed a comprehen-



*Jaycee and
Lubertha Johnson Parks*

sive regional study. A portion of the study examined the need for parks based on demographic standards for parks in the Las Vegas Valley. The study found that, based on national level of service standards, the valley was deficient in the amount of park space and recreational facilities provided for residents. It also found that national standards could not be directly applied to the Las Vegas Valley, partly because of the large amount of federal land designated for recreation and open space that is within a short driving distance. The result of the study was a recommendation by the SNSPA of 2.5 acres of park land per 1,000 residents. This standard is the recommended service level for the City of Las Vegas for long-range park planning purposes. While this is a pertinent barometer for citywide provision of parks, the far more important issue is providing parks that are geographically available to all neighborhoods.

As noted in the Background Section, the city has increased its level of service from 1.1 in 2000 to approximately 3.0. A large portion of the increase is due to the acquisition of Floyd Lamb Park from the State of Nevada. Although the city currently exceeds its adopted standard based on provision of parks citywide, a large disparity exists among the planning sectors described above. This analysis provides a target for the future provision of park acreage in the city, focusing on underserved areas, both in terms of population density and length of time with less than adequate parks and recreation facilities.

METHODOLOGY

In this analysis, a planned park is a park project that appears on the city of Las Vegas' 2007-2011 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP), but has not yet been built. To be included in the CIP, a project must go through the city's capital project coordination team and be reviewed based on priorities contained in the Master Plan. While this Master Plan/Capital Improvement Plan integration has not been fully implemented, it is anticipated that this will occur more stringently in future iterations of the CIP. A list of planned parks was compiled during the capital budget process using 2007-2011 CIP projects and the draft list of projects to be included in the 2008-2012 CIP. It represents the best available data on new city of Las Vegas park construction. The acreage for each planned park is shown to correspond to the year the project appears on the CIP. It should be noted that although the CIP is a five-year plan, a capital budget is prepared annually. Projects may be added, removed or revised during the preparation of the annual budget provided that locations are identified within the city's adopted master plan. To maintain accuracy and relevancy, the Parks & Recreation Element will be reviewed annually following adoption of the capital projects budget to reflect current data.

Tables 12 through 14 below display current and projected service levels citywide, and by geographic sector. Population estimates and projections are used to calculate the amount of acreage required to achieve the adopted standard of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents. That calculation is then compared to existing and planned park acreage to determine a surplus/deficit.

CITYWIDE

Table 12 : Current & Projected Service Levels Citywide

Citywide						
	2006	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Population	591,536	665,591	761,202	781,396	797,022	802,066
Park Acreage Built and Funded*	1,745.4	1,971.0	1,971.0	1,971.0	1,971.0	1,971.0
Acreage Needed to meet standard	1,478.8	1,664.0	1,903.0	1,953.5	1,992.6	2,005.2
Difference (surplus/deficit)	266.6	307.0	68.0	17.5	-21.6	-34.2
Level of Service	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5

* This number represents those parks currently in operation and/or approved and funded for construction.



*Lorenzi and
Mirabelli Parks*

SOUTHEAST SECTOR

The Southeast Sector contains some of the oldest neighborhoods and parks in the city. The area is largely built-out with few vacant parcels available for new construction. The population of this sector is expected to remain relatively unchanged between now and full build-out of the city. This sector is largely underserved in terms of park acreage with a level of service below the city standard. The Southeast Sector's current level of service is 1.33 acres per thousand residents. The table below shows that the deficit will decrease slightly over the next twenty-four years. However, the Southeast will remain the most deficient sector in terms of park acreage compared to other parts of the city.

Table 13 : Current & Projected Service Levels Southeast Sector

Southeast Sector						
	2006	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
SE Sector Population	224,684	224,684	225,910	225,910	225,910	225,910
SE Sector Park Acreage Built and Funded*	299.3	316.9	316.9	316.9	316.9	316.9
Acreage Needed to meet standard	561.7	561.7	564.8	564.8	564.8	564.8
Difference (surplus/deficit)	-262.4	-244.8	-247.9	-247.9	-247.9	-247.9
Level of Service	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4

* This number represents those parks currently in operation and/or approved and funded for construction.

CENTENNIAL HILLS SECTOR

With a level of service of 6.7 acres per thousand residents, the Centennial Hills Sector has the highest park acreage ratio of all planning sectors. This is the fastest growing area of the city with the population expected to increase 85% by 2030. The city has aggressively sought Recreation and Public Purpose (R&PP) leases from the BLM on vacant land in this area. Those leases enable park sites to be reserved in advance of new construction, allowing the city to keep pace with growth.

The addition of the Floyd Lamb Park to the city's inventory accounts for much of the gain in park acreage in the Centennial Hills Sector. The transfer of the 680-acre park from state ownership to city ownership occurred on July 1, 2007. Floyd Lamb is a regional park and will serve the sector, but will also provide neighborhood park functions for nearby residents. The chart below demonstrates that no new parks will be needed in this sector for the term of this update of the Parks & Recreation Element.



*Estelle Neal and
Mountain Ridge Parks*

Table 14 : Current & Projected Service Levels Centennial Hills Sector

Centennial Hills Sector						
	2006	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
CH Sector Population	160,161	201,158	255,626	275,820	291,446	296,489
CH Sector Park Acreage Built and Funded*	1,072.5	1,251.9	1,251.9	1,251.9	1,251.9	1,251.9
Acreage Needed to meet standard	400.4	502.9	639.1	689.5	728.6	741.2
Difference (surplus/deficit)	672.1	749.0	612.8	562.4	523.3	510.7
Level of Service	6.7	6.2	4.9	4.5	4.3	4.2

* This number represents those parks currently in operation and/or approved and funded for construction.

SOUTHWEST SECTOR

The Southwest Sector is largely built-out. The majority of the future growth will occur within the Summerlin master planned community. The sector as a whole, including the Summerlin population and park acreage, enjoys a level of service that is equal to or greater than city standards, even though Summerlin builds and maintains its own parks.

Within the boundaries of Summerlin, parks owned/ maintained by the homeowners association are provided at 4.4 acres per 1,000 residents. The projection for Summerlin includes future park acreage to build out according to the Summerlin West Development Agreement. Because the exact year the parks will be built is undetermined, the total acreage was equally divided between now and 2030.

The city is responsible for serving the areas of the Southwest Sector outside of Summerlin with parks. Currently, the area has 2.4 acres of city parks per 1,000 residents, in keeping with city standards. The sector in its entirety and the portion outside of Summerlin are projected to have adequate park service levels. It should be noted that no new parks are shown on the current five-year CIP within the Southwest Sector outside of Summerlin.

Table 15 : Current & Projected Service Levels Southwest Sector

Southwest Sector						
	2006	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
SW Sector Population (w/ Summerlin)	206,691	239,749	279,666	279,666	279,666	279,666
SW Sector Planned Park Acreage (w/Summerlin)	610.6	670.9	702.6	734.3	766.0	797.7
Acreage Needed to meet standard	516.7	599.4	699.2	699.2	699.2	699.2
Difference (surplus/deficit)	93.9	71.5	3.4	35.1	66.8	98.5
Level of Service	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8
SW Sector Population (w/o Summerlin)	153,518	155,578	155,578	155,578	155,578	155,578
SW Sector Park Acreage (w/o Summerlin)	362.4	391.0	391.0	391.0	391.0	391.0
Acreage Needed to meet standard	383.8	388.9	388.9	388.9	388.9	388.9
Difference (surplus/deficit)	-21.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1
Level of Service	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5

SPATIAL ANALYSIS

Pursuant to national standards, parks should be located in an equitable manner so that all city residents are within walking distance to a neighborhood park. Master Plan goals and policies, including Policy 3.1.3, echo this concept that every park and recreational facility for each type be located within the appropriately defined distance. It is important to note that all parks provide service at the neighborhood level, regardless of their sizes and, therefore, serve as neighborhood parks. For example, the Children's Memorial Park is categorized as a community park based on its acreage, but serves as both a neighborhood park and a community park. The same is true of regional parks, as these parks also provide service at the community and neighborhood levels within that radius.

The maximum recommended service area of a neighborhood park is a half-mile radius. It should be noted that the service area radii do not reflect all access barriers to parks. Physical barriers to pedestrian traffic, such as arterial streets and walls around gated communities should also taken into consideration when locating neighborhood parks.

The half-mile service area standard allows for a spatial analysis on the distribution of parks throughout the city and by planning sector. Map 9 displays all existing and planned city parks. For this purpose, a planned park is a park project that appears on the 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program, indicating that it has priority for funding.

A spatial analysis is an appropriate method to evaluate the physical distribution of parks, but is only one aspect of the park system. Parks can meet the spatial criteria, but fail to meet the needs for parks in this community based on demographic or functional standards. Nor does the spatial analysis address the temporal inequities in aging neighborhoods that have not been served with city parks and recreation facilities for a number of decades. This spatial analysis and corresponding maps should help guide decisions on the location of future neighborhood parks to guarantee equitable geographic distribution.

CITYWIDE

The city of Las Vegas covers 131.2 square miles. Of that area, 70.8 square miles, or fifty-four percent (54%), lies outside of the one-half mile service radii of a city-owned and maintained neighborhood park. Approximately 262,836 people (44% of total city population) live in the underserved areas citywide. Of these, 20% live in neighborhoods that are around 40 to 60 years old. If the population and park acreage of Summerlin is taken out of the calculation, thirty-nine percent



*Patriot and
Ethel Pearson Parks*

(39%) of the city's population is not within walking distance of a city park. To examine the underserved areas in more detail, 20 study areas were delineated for review. Population, average age of housing stock and accessibility issues in each area are displayed by sector in the following tables. The location of the 20 study areas, along with the underserved population in each, is contained on Map 12. Study area numbers on the tables for each sector correspond to those displayed on Map 12. The average age of the housing stock in each study area is shown on Map 14.

SOUTHEAST SECTOR

The Southeast Sector has the smallest percentage (28%) of land and population (29.5%) lying outside the recommended half-mile service radius of a neighborhood park. Regardless, there are still large areas of the sector that are underserved in terms of access to park facilities. It is important to note that the city's oldest and most densely populated neighborhoods are found in the underserved areas of the southeast sector, with over half the population in these areas (53,584/51%) living in housing stock that was built prior to 1970; 79% (83,277) residing in housing constructed before 1980; and with the entire population (105,874/100%) of the underserved area living in housing built prior to 1990.

Table 16 : Underserved Population & Housing Age Southeast Sector*

Study Area**	Underserved Population	Average Housing Age Based on Year of Construction ***	Accessibility Issues*
1	21,931	1970-79	U.S. 95 corridor splits the southwest corner; Las Vegas Wash splits the northeast corner
2	17,566	1946-59	U.S. 95 and I-15 corridors intersect the area; the Fremont business district
3	9,898	1960-69	Union Park, Union Pacific Railroad; U.S. 95 and I-15 corridors
4	19,991	1960-69	Sahara Avenue; Charleston Boulevard; I-15
5	7,762	1970-79	Charleston Boulevard; Rainbow Boulevard
8	6,129	1960-69	U.S. 95; Decatur Boulevard
9	8,852	1980-89	U.S. 95; Rancho Drive; Owens Avenue; Vegas Drive
10	13,745	1980-89	Lake Mead Boulevard; Smoke Ranch Road
TOTAL	105,874		

Source: Planning & Development Department

** Study Areas delineated on Map 12

*** Clark Co. Assessor (Note: Ranges of average year of construction include housing built prior to and after the years listed)

SOUTHWEST SECTOR

Approximately 30 acres (63%) of the Southwest Sector are more than a half-mile from a city-owned neighborhood park. The percentage of the population in the sector not served by a city park is 49.7%. For an accurate assessment of parks in the Southwest Sector, the spatial analysis has been performed both with and without Summerlin. The inset on Map 9 shows park coverage including Summerlin-owned parks. When the population and park acreage of Summerlin are included, the percentage of population not served by a neighborhood park decreases to 32%, which is comparable to the other sectors. The majority of the sector is well served by either city parks or Summerlin parks. The underserved area includes the four square miles in the southern portion of the sector that is developed as "Peccole Ranch," "The Lakes" and "Canyon Gate." These communities were developed without any park space. As shown in the table below, 82% of the underserved population (77,540) in the southwest sector lives in housing stock constructed after 1989.

Table 17 : Underserved Population & Housing Age Southwest Sector*

Study Area**	Underserved Population	Average Housing Age Based on Year of Construction***	Accessibility Issues
6	16,912	1980-89	Fort Apache Road
7	19,667	1990-2004	Charleston Boulevard; Fort Apache Road; Rampart Boulevard
11	11,245	1990-2004	Sun City gated community; Cheyenne Avenue; drainage channel; Durango Drive
20	46,628	1990-2004	Summerlin Parkway; Clark County 215
TOTAL	94,452		

Source: Planning & Development Department

** Study Areas delineated on Map 12

*** Clark Co. Assessor (Note: Ranges of average year of construction include housing built prior to and after the years listed)

CENTENNIAL HILLS SECTOR

Sixty percent (60%) of the land area of this sector falls outside of a neighborhood park service area, with thirty-nine (39%) of the population not living within an easy walking distance of a park. As indicated in the table below, 74% of the population (46,454) in this sector resides in housing built after 1989. The Centennial Hills sector is the largest in terms of land area and has the greatest amount of vacant, developable land in the city. Neighborhood parks should be planned as growth occurs so they are distributed equitably throughout the sector.

Table 18 : Underserved Population & Housing Age Centennial Hills Sector*

Study Area**	Underserved Population	Average Housing Age Based on Year of Construction***	Accessibility Issues
12	4,331	1990-2004	Clark County 215
13	11,725	1980-89	Rancho Drive; U.S. 95
14	14,029	1990-2004	Clark County 215, U.S. 95, Ann Road
15	4,677	1990-2004	U.S. 95; Ann Road
16	0	Undeveloped	U.S. 95
17	22,039	1990-2004	Clark County 215
18	5,709	1990-2004	U.S. 95 and Clark County 215
19	0	Undeveloped	U.S. 95
TOTAL	62,510		

Source: Planning & Development Department

** Study Areas delineated on Map 12

*** Clark Co. Assessor (Note: Ranges of average year of construction include housing built prior to and after the years listed)

PARK DISTRIBUTION BASED ON SERVICE AREA

As noted previously, the maximum recommended service area of a neighborhood park is a half-mile radius, but there are also physical barriers to pedestrian traffic, such as arterial streets, commercial centers, etc. that are taken into consideration when locating neighborhood parks. However, for the purpose of this analysis, the half-mile service area standard was used. Map 9 displays all existing and planned city parks. For the purpose of this element, a planned park is a park project that appears on the 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program.

This spatial analysis indicates that, while the Southeast Sector is adequately served by the number and distribution of

parks, it is severely underserved in terms of park acreage. An analysis of service area provides a description of the status of the park system, points to future need, and assists the city in determining where to allocate new park resources. Analyzing the physical location of parks along with the recommended service area is the first step, but linking level of service with service area standards, population density, and age of neighborhood provides a more telling story of where the actual need exists for park space.

PARKS DISTRIBUTION BASED ON POPULATION DENSITY

A spatial analysis evaluates the geographic distribution of parks, but only looks at one aspect of the park system. Parks can meet the spatial service criteria, but fail to meet the needs for parks in this community based on demographic or functional factors. For purposes of the Parks & Recreation Element, population density was used to evaluate whether existing parks are overburdened due to the number of people they must accommodate, and to point to the locations where the need is greatest for future parks. This should guide decisions on citing future neighborhood parks with the goal of equitable distribution. The analysis can be further refined at the neighborhood level to include other demographic factors, such as race and income, to determine the social equity of park distribution. In addition to population density, age of housing stock has also been incorporated into this analysis. This allows identification of chronically underserved areas in the most densely populated areas of the city as shown on Map 15.

Previous analysis has shown that, with currently approved parks and expected development, the city of Las Vegas will have adequate park acreage to achieve the goal of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents. This is due in large part to construction of a number of large regional and community parks. Therefore, the city must now address park needs in some of the more densely populated areas that are currently relying on relatively small neighborhood parks.

While the overall citywide goal of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents is nearly accomplished, the larger issue is whether the level of service is deficient in certain areas of the city. In order to address this question, the spatial location of park acreage relative to population has been examined. Maps 10 and 11 display the population density of the city of Las Vegas, along with locations of parks relative to the population density. The densest areas of the city, shown in purple and red, are located around downtown Las Vegas within the Southeast Sector, near U.S. 95 in the Southwest Sector and in dispersed clusters in the Centennial Hills Sector. The high density areas represent



*Pioneer, Police Memorial
Parks, Pueblo and
Rainbow Parks*

20.01 – 30 persons per acre and are shown in purple. The red, urban areas signify 12.01-20 persons per acre. The majority of the parks in Centennial Hills are larger than the parks located downtown and older areas of the city.

Map 9 illustrates the half-mile service radius for each city of Las Vegas neighborhood park. Ideally, all city parks would meet both the level of service and service area standards adopted by the city, currently set at 2.5 acres of park space per 1,000 residents within the one-half mile buffer around each park. To measure whether all city parks are of adequate size to serve the surrounding population and are located to be accessible to the neighborhood, an analysis of population densities within each park service zone (one-half mile radius) was performed. Map 13 shows that only 28% of the city of Las Vegas' population lives in areas meeting the standard of having at least 2.5 acres of park space for every 1,000 residents (represented by blue areas on the map). 42% live in areas with a service level of only one park acre per 1,000 residents (shown in red, orange and yellow). The light and dark purple areas on Map 13 have less than one park acre within the one half-mile park service zone. The majority of these areas are within the Southeast Sector, indicating that while the parks are located in a manner that makes them accessible, the parks are small and the acreage is not sufficient to meet adopted standards or the needs of residents. The white areas with no park service are described further below.

Map 11 illustrates the population density of those areas in the city of Las Vegas that fall outside the one-half mile service radius of any neighborhood park. The analysis shows that 44% of the population of the city of Las Vegas does not live within one-half mile of a city of Las Vegas neighborhood park. Map 12 displays the underserved population in each of the 20 study areas throughout the city. Map 14 shows the average housing age in each of the 20 study areas defined on May 12. Map 15 combines the population density and housing age information, graphically highlighting the most densely populated areas in the city that have endured the longest periods of time with substandard park and recreation service. As indicated on Map 12, the most chronically underserved area is located in the southeast sector in study area 2. The second most chronically underserved area is also found in the southeast sector in study area 4, with the third being located in study area 1. New park planning and construction efforts should be focused in these areas where the highest need exists and where new parks and recreation facilities will benefit the most residents.

It is important to note that the suggested level of service standard, as it relates to service area, is not a perfect tool for gauging the adequacy of park space. As previously noted, there are a number of factors that contribute to the location

and type of recreational space and facilities that are available in certain areas. One of these factors is the national standard for various activity types and another is the specific needs of an area as determined by the residents of that area. These are discussed in more detail in the following two sections.

LEISURE SERVICES FACILITIES/CENTERS DISTRIBUTION BASED ON POPULATION DENSITY

A spatial analysis of the distribution of all regional, community and neighborhood leisure services facilities and their service areas is shown on Map 7. The service areas are determined based on the standards established in Table 19. This methodology differs from that for parks which used a ½ mile radius to delineate service areas. The spatial analysis for centers is population based. Thus, a green circle shown around a regional facility on Map 7 indicates an area having a population of approximately 75,000 people, the standard for regional centers. Maps 7a, 7b, 7c and 7d display the service areas for neighborhood, community, regional and aquatic centers, respectively. The composite analysis in Map 7 reveals a population of 165,293 city residents not currently living within the service area of any category of leisure facility, excluding aquatic centers. This translates into more than one-fourth (28%) of the city's residents living in underserved areas throughout the city.

Neighborhood Leisure Service Centers, as displayed on Map 7a, have a service area based on a ratio of one center per 10,000 people. The service area for each neighborhood center as shown in yellow contains approximately 10,000 city residents. In several instances, there are overlapping service areas among centers, primarily those clustered in the Southeast Sector. Areas underserved by neighborhood centers include all of the white portions of the city not included in a yellow circle. The Centennial Hills and Southwest Sectors are the most deficient in neighborhood centers based on this type of spatial analysis.

Community Leisure Service Centers, as shown on Map 7b, have a service area based on a ratio of one center per 25,000 people, shown in gold. Similar to the distribution of neighborhood centers, there is overlap in service areas, most notably in the Southeast Sector. The greatest deficiency appears to be in the Centennial Hills Sector, followed by the Southwest Sector, based on the population ratio standard.

Regional Leisure Service Centers, as indicated on Map 7c, have service areas defined in red based on a ratio of one center per 75,000 people. In this case, there is overlap between the service areas of the two regional centers in the Southeast



*Clarence Ray and
Rafael Rivera Parks*

Sector. The largest geographic areas underserved by regional centers appear to be in the Centennial Hills and Southwest Sectors, based on this type of spatial analysis.

Aquatic Facilities, as shown on Map 7d, have service areas identified in light blue based on a ratio of one center per 20,000 people. As noted with other types of centers, there is some overlap of service areas in the Southeast Sector. The greatest service deficiencies appear to be located in the Southwest and Centennial Hills Sectors. There is also a significant gap in service in that portion of the Southeast Sector located west of Interstate 15.

OTHER SITE SELECTION FACTORS

To determine new locations for constructing leisure services centers, the city utilizes demographic information, including median age and household income, and to meet future needs, should focus first on those areas indicated on Maps 7 through 7d where the population is underserved. In also assessing community recreation offerings by private and non-profit organizations in the areas underserved by municipal facilities, the city can identify if there is a need for a new leisure services center. The city chooses not to compete for recreation programming with existing services already provided to the public. However, affordable services are a concern for city residents and the city considers this in its programming and site selection for new facilities.

In addition to information provided by the spatial analysis, other factors to consider when prioritizing construction of new leisure services facilities include: land constraints, city tax revenues, R&PP leases on land, community partnership opportunities, such as those with the YMCA and school district, identified service level standards, and citizen feedback from the Community Needs Assessment Program surveys and other types of public feedback regarding leisure services demand.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

In 2005, the Department of Leisure Services conducted a survey to gauge the recreational and programming priorities of city residents. The survey was designed to gather information in the following topical areas:

Recreation habits

- Existing and desired recreation habits – citywide and by ward – for youths, adults and seniors

Facilities

- Interest in additional indoor and outdoor facilities
- Types of facilities desired
- Amenities desired for indoor recreation centers
- Usage of community centers

Programming

- Methods community members use to find out about recreational, and cultural programs and services
- Resident's willingness to travel for services
- Programming input for those with disabilities
- Usage of city-managed senior centers

Policies and Planning

- Community priorities for leisure service facilities, general programming and teen programming
- Fee structure, funding sources and service priorities
- Facility development priorities



*Doc Romeo and
Stewart Place Parks*

METHODOLOGY

Surveys were distributed to a random sample via door-to-door delivery and mail. 23,600 surveys were distributed with 1,787 returned for a return ratio of 7.6%. Given the population of Las Vegas, the number of surveys distributed and the number of returned surveys, a 2.1% margin of error at the 95% confidence level was achieved. Survey results were broken down both citywide and by ward. Below are some of the important findings from the survey.

KEY FINDINGS

- Priorities for facilities are as follows: maintain existing facilities, upgrade existing facilities, and build new facilities.
- Priorities for programming are as follows: youth programming, senior programming, and general health and fitness programming.
- 100% of responses indicated at least conditional supports for a tax measure for improvements to and acquisition of parks. Swimming, walking, hiking, weight training and going to the gym are listed as the top “active” recreation activities. Reading, listening to

music, participating in family activities, arts & crafts, gardening and gourmet cooking are the top “passive” recreation activities of respondents.

- 9 out of 10 of the most popular activities indicated are significantly above the average participation rate.
- Activities that respondents would like to do more of include attending concerts, fairs and festivals; participating in arts and crafts; and indoor swimming.
- A significant number of respondents feel that additional outdoor facilities are needed in their area. This is particularly true in Wards 3, 5 and 6.
- Support for an indoor recreation center is very strong across all wards.
- In all wards of the City, respondents indicated a need for basic park amenities, such as paved trails, picnic areas, playgrounds, and basketball courts.
- Respondents indicated that “family activities” are a recreation option that residents both do and want to do. Additionally, family-oriented outdoor facility choices (such as water play parks, family picnic areas, small water playgrounds, tot lots and open grassy areas) are at the top of the list of facility priorities.
- Other strong parallels between activities and facilities chosen are as follows: respondent indicated a strong interest in both outdoor and indoor swimming, and a pool is the third-highest facility choice of respondents; a strong interest in walking for pleasure was also demonstrated, and paved trails are a top facility priority.
- There are also facility choices that are not congruent. Respondents indicated an interest in basketball courts and sport fields. However, basketball, football and soccer rank relatively low when asked what activities they are currently participating in or would like to do.
- Construction of water play features, indoor swimming pools, and football, soccer, baseball and softball fields received strong support statistically and in write-in responses, citywide.
- Most respondents find out about recreation programs and services via word of mouth, program guides and local newspaper advertisements.
- If the parks and recreation budget were decreased, respondents in all wards would want to reduce or eliminate plans to construct new parks and facilities. Respondents would avoid eliminating or reducing operational hours at existing community centers and swimming pools.
- Parks are second only to home as a place where respondents spend their free time.

The following table illustrates facility needs based on each planning sector's population. Based on current service standards, each sector is deficient in the number of all categories of leisure services facilities available to the citizens of Las Vegas, except in the Southwest Sector, where the standard for regional centers is currently met.

Table 19 : Leisure Facility Needs by Sector

Southeast Sector				
Type of Facility	Service Standard	Needs based on 2006 population of 225,000*	Existing Facilities	Surplus (Deficiency)
Neighborhood Center ⁶	1 per 10,000 residents	23	14	(9)
Community Center	1 per 25,000 residents	9	6	(3)
Regional Center	1 per 75,000 residents	3	2	(1)
Southwest Sector				
Type of Facility	Service Standard	Needs based on 2006 population of 207,000*	Existing Facilities	Surplus (Deficiency)
Neighborhood Center	1 per 10,000 residents	20	4	(6)
Community Center	1 per 25,000 residents	8	2	(6)
Regional Center	1 per 75,000 residents	2	2	(0)
Centennial Hills Sector				
Type of Facility	Service Standard	Needs based on 2006 population of 160,000*	Existing Facilities	Surplus (Deficiency)
Neighborhood Center	1 per 10,000 residents	16	4	(12)
Community Center	1 per 25,000 residents	6	1	(5)
Regional Center	1 per 75,000 residents	2	1	(1)

* Rounded to nearest thousand

⁶ Community Schools offer comparable programs to Neighborhood Centers and are included as Neighborhood Centers in the level of service area assessment.

FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS

The above sections establish guidelines for determining the general location, spatial distribution, and number of parks needed at full build-out of the city. A functional analysis identifies recreational needs by activity type using national standards as a guide. Accordingly, the functional analysis will determine the level of service needed, whether existing facilities are adequate to serve the existing population, and the level of service needed for each function for the community at full build-out.

Several assumptions must be established as recreational demands and interests change over time. For example, the Department of Leisure Services has noticed a recent demand for lacrosse fields. This growing sport has been recognized by the city and the city has responded by planning several lacrosse fields as part of park construction in the 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan. Demographic shifts in the lifecycle of a neighborhood also result in changing recreational demands. For example, a neighborhood with a concentration of families with young children will have different needs as the children mature. The impacts of these changes can be costly to the city as it attempts to provide appropriate amenities and programming for its residents. One response is to provide multi-use spaces and fields that accommodate a variety of sports.

Service standards have been established using national standards as a guide, but have been adjusted to local conditions based on use patterns, climatic conditions and citizen surveys. Determination of future facility needs should be subject to periodic review. While it is impracticable to forecast the exact location of sports fields throughout the city, it is important to set a benchmark for the number of amenities needed in future park construction.

In recent years, the NRPA has renounced the “one size fits all” approach and recommends that communities develop park and recreational facility standards that fit individual needs and circumstances. Under this approach, the NRPA recommends using public meetings, community surveys, and interviews with various department heads, league presidents, and the recreational program directors to establish the current facility utilization and future needs.⁷

CITYWIDE

The table below shows specific comparisons between recommended standards and the city's existing functional level of services. These comparisons indicate that the city is in need of all types of fields and recreational amenities, except jogging tracks. Major deficiencies exist in all the sports field categories. As new parks are planned and designed, consideration should be given to the standards established in this plan and specific facility needs should be assessed during the annual capital budget planning process.

CITY WIDE

Table 20 : Recreation Facilities Service Standards Citywide

Citywide				
2006 Population: 591,536 2030 Projected Population: 802,065				
Amenity	Recommended Service Standard	Current CLV Inventory	Current Surplus (Deficit)	Projected Surplus (Deficit)
Basketball Court	1 : 5,000 residents	46	(72)	(114)
Tennis Court	1 : 2,000 residents	65	(231)	(336)
Volleyball Court	1 : 5,000 residents	18	(100)	(142)
Lacrosse Field*	1 : 5,000 residents	0	(118)	(118)
Baseball & Softball Field	1 : 15,000 residents	48	9	(5)
Football Field*	1 : 20,000 residents	5	(25)	(35)
Soccer Field*	1 : 10,000 residents	39	(20)	(41)
Golf Course	1 : 50,000 residents	4	(8)	(12)
Jogging Track	1 : 20,000 residents	43	13	3
Swimming Pool	1 : 20,000 residents	8	(22)	(32)

* Both Football and Soccer Fields can accommodate Lacrosse, and Lacrosse fields can accommodate both Football and Soccer as well. Several Lacrosse fields are projected for future city park projects.

SOUTHEAST SECTOR

Table 21 : Recreation Facilities Service Standards Southeast Sector

Southeast Sector				
2006 Population: 224,684 2030 Projected Population: 225,910				
Amenity	Recommended Service Standard	Current SE Inventory	Current Surplus (Deficit)	Projected Surplus (Deficit)
Basketball Court	1 : 5,000 residents	29	(16)	(16)
Tennis Court	1 : 2,000 residents	17	(95)	(96)
Volleyball Court	1 : 5,000 residents	3	(42)	(42)
Baseball & Softball Field	1 : 15,000 residents	17	2	2
Football Field	1 : 20,000 residents	0	(11)	(11)
Soccer Field	1 : 10,000 residents	11	(11)	(12)
Golf Course	1 : 50,000 residents	2	(2)	(3)
Jogging Track	1 : 20,000 residents	14	3	3
Swimming Pool	1 : 20,000 residents	1	(10)	(10)

SOUTHWEST SECTOR

Table 22 : Recreation Facilities Service Standards Southwest Sector

Southwest Sector				
2006 Population: 206,691 2030 Projected Population: 279,666				
Amenity	Recommended Service Standard	Current SW Inventory	Current Surplus (Deficit)	Projected Surplus (Deficit)
Basketball Court	1 : 5,000 residents	5	(36)	(51)
Tennis Court	1 : 2,000 residents	36	(67)	(104)
Volleyball Court	1 : 5,000 residents	3	(38)	(53)
Baseball & Softball Field	1 : 15,000 residents	10	(4)	(9)
Football Field	1 : 20,000 residents	5	(5)	(9)
Soccer Field	1 : 10,000 residents	22	1	(6)
Golf Course	1 : 50,000 residents	1	(3)	(5)
Jogging Track	1 : 20,000 residents	13	3	(1)
Swimming Pool	1 : 20,000 residents	1	(9)	(13)

CENTENNIAL HILLS SECTOR

Table 23 : Recreation Facility Service Standards - Centennial Hills Sector

Centennial Hills Sector				
2006 Population: 160,161 2030 Projected Population: 296,489				
Amenity	Recommended Service Standard	Current CH Inventory	Current Surplus (Deficit)	Projected Surplus (Deficit)
Basketball Court	1 : 5,000 residents	12	(20)	(47)
Tennis Court	1 : 2,000 residents	12	(68)	(136)
Volleyball Court	1 : 5,000 residents	12	(20)	(47)
Baseball & Softball Field	1 : 15,000 residents	21	10	1
Football Field	1 : 20,000 residents	0	(8)	(15)
Soccer Field	1 : 10,000 residents	6	(10)	(24)
Golf Course	1 : 50,000 residents	1	(2)	(5)
Jogging Track	1 : 20,000 residents	16	8	1
Swimming Pool	1 : 20,000 residents	6	(2)	(9)

IMPLEMENTATION

The challenge for any long-range, municipal master plan is to remain relevant and useful throughout its lifecycle. A master plan outlines a vision for the future to be implemented incrementally over time. This Parks & Recreation Element is intended to execute the master plan by guiding individual decisions on the location and funding of city parks. Four main recommendations emerge from the analysis of the current park system. The recommendations are:

- Build neighborhood parks in dense, chronically underserved areas
- Connect parks planning to the Capital Improvements Planning process
- Build amenities to keep pace with growth
- Implement urban pathways in lieu of green space in the urban core

One of the main implementation tools for the master plan is the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The CIP is a fiscal and management tool used by the City to allocate its resources. This element should be regarded as a resource for the City to use during the CIP process to help inform capital programming decisions.

The recommendations below were developed from the multiple levels of analysis detailed in the previous sections and are intended to be comprehensive, taking into account the park needs of residents, current conditions, future park expenditures and future population growth. A long-term plan must be flexible to adapt to changing political, economic and social conditions. The goal of this element is to provide information and identify target areas having the greatest need for park and recreation center development (areas that do not meet established service levels or areas that are not within recommended service radii). This information can be used as a guide for decision makers to determine when and where to build new parks and centers.

RECOMMENDATION #1: BUILD NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS IN DENSE, CHRONICALLY UNDERSERVED AREAS

Prioritize parks planning and implementation in the most densely populated areas of the city that have endured the longest periods of time with substandard parks and recreation services.



*Chester Stupak and
Sunny Springs Parks*

STRATEGIES

- **Citywide**
 - Utilize the parks and community centers analyses and mapping contained in this element as tools for achieving equitable distribution of parks and recreation centers throughout the city.
 - New park projects should be located within the underserved areas shown on Maps 9, 11 and 15 of this element, with top tier priority given to underserved areas in the southeast sector;
 - Locate neighborhood parks with one-half mile service areas that are not obstructed by physical barriers to pedestrian traffic such as arterial streets;
 - Locate parks taking into account a range of logistical considerations such as proximity to highway access and potential for impact of community-level services on surrounding areas; and
 - Locate parks and centers with general and specific functions throughout the community that reflect the needs and interests of the areas served.
 - Coordinate location of parks with Clark County and the city of North Las Vegas where feasible.
- **Southeast Sector** – The overall parks acreage in this sector is well below adopted standards. Based on the analyses contained in this element, the following priorities are recommended to achieve equity in the most densely populated underserved areas of the city in which parks and recreation services have been substandard for the longest duration.
 - New park projects (of all sizes) should be proposed within un-served areas, in accordance with the following priorities:
 - **#1 Priority:** Area No. 2, as shown on Map 15
 - **#2 Priority:** Area No. 4, as shown on Map 15
 - **#3 Priority:** Area No. 1, as shown on Map 15
 - **#4 Priority:** Area No. 5, as shown on Map 15
 - **#5 Priority:** Area No. 8, as shown on Map 15
 - To add to the overall acreage within the sector, target acquisition opportunities to add acreage to existing parks.
- **Southwest Sector** – this sector is the most stable in terms of parks. Overall, the adopted 1/2 mile radius standard is met. The sector is largely built-out, and agreements with master planned communities ensure adequate park coverage in undeveloped areas. However, as indicated on Map 12 and Map 15, there are underserved areas with significant populations living in neighborhoods that have existed longer than those in the Centennial Hills Sector.
 - Continue to work with Summerlin to ensure that future development adequately incorporates park space, such as the master plan for Summerlin West; and

- Identify sites within underserved areas not located within a master planned community that may be suitable for park development, in accordance with the following priorities:
 - **#6 Priority:** Area No. 10, as shown on Map 15
 - **#7 Priority:** Area No. 6, as shown on Map 15
 - **#8 Priority:** Area No. 7, as shown on Map 15
- **Centennial Hills Sector** – Overall level of service is high in this sector, but the parks tend to be large and not well distributed geographically throughout the neighborhoods.
 - Smaller, neighborhood parks with appropriate amenities should be planned and built so that every resident is within walking distance of a park, focusing first on areas with the highest population densities, in accordance with the following priorities:
 - **#9 Priority:** Area No. 17, as shown on Map 15
 - **#10 Priority:** Area No. 13, as shown on Map 15

Close-up maps of the top ten priority areas are included in the appendices.

RECOMMENDATION #2: CONNECT PARKS AND LEISURE FACILITIES PLANNING TO THE CIP PROCESS

The City has recently changed the way it plans for its capital projects by standardizing the CIP process. This new approach stems from the City's strategic planning efforts and a move towards performance based budgeting. Coordinating capital expenditures so that budgeting and planning efforts are linked logically and efficiently is one way to support the City's strategic planning priority of "manage cost and revenue resources to achieve efficient operations." Work should continue to integrate the City of Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan with the CIP process. This will ensure that the City is allocating its resources in a manner that achieves the vision set forth in the Master Plan. The most logical way that this document can influence the CIP process is to focus new park expenditures on areas that are underserved in terms of the level of service and location criteria set forth in the element.

STRATEGIES

- Consult the maps and priority recommendations provided in this element during the CIP process. Proposed projects should demonstrate how they improve service levels in the identified chronically underserved areas, and in the City overall;
- Park projects proposed in areas that are adequately served should have a lower funding priority than projects in underserved areas;
- Update the Parks & Recreation Element annually after the adoption of the capital budget to account for new parks

that have been constructed and to update planned parks based on the priority selection system. Perform new level of service spatial analysis to determine if the City is meeting established goals;

- Monitor the population growth, change in recreation trends, and levels of service, to better identify projects for the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) plan; and
- Coordinate the replacement schedule for existing parks and leisure facilities amenities with the CIP process.

RECOMMENDATION #3: BUILD AMENITIES TO KEEP PACE WITH GROWTH

Recent progress in the total amount of city park acreage is the first step to fulfilling the recreational needs of city residents. Attention should also be directed towards providing appropriate categories of recreation centers in accordance with the needs analysis presented in Table 19. This needs assessment indicates that the City is deficient in the number of all types of recreation centers throughout the city, as well as in providing the amenities that residents desire. Several recent surveys have documented the park and recreational needs and desires of residents. In addition, current national data about the recommended number of sports fields for communities also indicates a shortage throughout the city. The functional analysis projects that the shortages will remain as the City's population increases.

STRATEGIES

- Provide active recreational facilities based on the adjusted national standards and aim to tailor service standards for recreational facilities to the population's identified needs;
- Prioritize provision of new leisure services facilities based on the needs analysis contained in Table 19, and other spatial analysis and site selection factors presented on page XXX, as recommended below:
 - **#1 Priority:** Southwest Sector, outside current service areas shown on Map 7
 - **#2 Priority:** Centennial Hills Sector, outside current service areas shown on Map 7
 - **#3 Priority:** Southeast Sector, outside current service areas as shown on Map 7.
- Continue biannual assessments to measure residents' park and recreational needs;
- Conceptual design work for new park and recreation projects should take into consideration existing amenities in the area and aim to reduce deficiencies; and
- Continue to coordinate with the Clark County School District to identify opportunities for co-location and joint use of sports fields and other facilities.

RECOMMENDATION #4: IMPLEMENT URBAN PATHWAYS IN LIEU OF GREEN SPACE IN THE URBAN CORE

The development of smaller scale urban spaces can bolster revitalization efforts downtown. The amount of park space downtown does not meet the needs of current residents, and the construction of high-rise residential projects will only increase this gap. To keep pace with demand and meet established service levels, additional acreage is needed within the Downtown Centennial Plan boundary.

Research of past City of Las Vegas Master Plans indicates that downtown park space has been recognized as a key component of that area since the 1960's. There are many challenges to providing recreational opportunities in a highly urban area with little available land. Land values are typically higher than suburban or undeveloped land and historical development patterns of small, 25' by 140' lots make land assemblage difficult. In the absence of a large, centrally-located park, the City should develop small scale urban spaces, dispersed throughout the downtown area, that provide both passive and active recreation.

STRATEGIES:

- Along with the Redevelopment Agency, formulate a land acquisition strategy for inclusion in the Downtown Centennial Plan. The strategy should involve several methods including:
 - Fee simple land purchases;
 - Land donations/gifts;
 - Leases;
 - Easements;
 - Partnerships;
 - Tax foreclosures;
 - Exactions;
 - Property condemnation, and
 - Land exchanges
- Develop guidelines for future private open spaces; and
- Create a RDA Implementation Strategy that directs a portion of the tax increment into urban park/plaza projects.



*Teton Trails, Bruce Trent,
Wildwood and Bettye Wilson
Soccer Complex Parks*

CONCLUSION

Las Vegas is constantly evolving – the natural environment, the built environment, and the needs of its residents. The wide-open desert, scenic vistas and mountain backdrop that first gave way to a dusty, railroad town, has been transformed by spectacular population and economic growth over the past 25 years. Although new development continues at the edge of the City, redevelopment projects are attracting residents to the downtown and to established neighborhoods. As the City is growing and becoming more dense and diverse, the evolution continues.

The park and recreational needs of Las Vegas' residents are also evolving. Much progress had been made in the City's park system and the City well-equipped to deal with the demands of new development. Innovative mechanisms to acquire park land have been successful in increasing park acreage in newly developing areas of the City. Residents enjoy a wide range of recreational, arts and cultural programming, from pottery classes to organized sports, in the community centers and playing fields operated by the City. However, much is left to be accomplished. Access to parks must be equitable for all of the City's residents, not just residents in newly developing areas. Every neighborhood needs a park to bring people together, to create a community and to provide natural amenities in urban areas. Parks and recreation facilities located within walking distance of every residence in the City also foster healthy, active lifestyles for all ages. The City is committed to providing these public spaces in a timely, efficient and fiscally responsible manner.

Las Vegas' park system is complex. The Las Vegas Valley is set amidst millions of acres of federally designated open spaces. The natural terrain is varied and includes the 12,000-foot peak of Mount Charleston in the Spring Mountain Range and the soaring sandstone formations of Red Rock National Conservation Area. These areas provide ample recreational opportunities. Hiking, mountain biking and rock climbing is available at the doorstep of the City's boundary. These federal areas reduce the burden of local agencies to provide large quantities of land for park development, but are only a supplement to the City's park system. With the stunning natural setting of Southern Nevada as a backdrop, the City of Las Vegas park system must serve many functions to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse populace. Parks are a place for residents to play, to connect with nature, to renew their spirit and to meet with neighbors. The park system must accommodate both active and passive recreational needs and include programmable and non-programmable park spaces. If these goals are accomplished, Las Vegas will remain a premier place to live, work, and, most importantly, play.



*Frank Wright Plaza and
Wooster Family Park*

REFERENCES

NRPA

American Journal of Preventive Medicine

Indicators of Activity-Friendly Communities: An Evidence-Based Consensus Process Pages 515-524

Laura K. Brennan Ramirez, Christine M. Hoehner, Ross C. Brownson, Rebeka Cook, C. Tracy Orleans, Marla Hollander, Dianne C. Barker, Philip Bors, Reid Ewing, Richard Killingsworth et al

Volume 31, Issue 6, Pages A1-A2, 455-544 (December 2006)

Maps I-I5, pgs 73-101 Here